

THE GRAVES
OF
MYLES STANDISH
AND OTHER PILGRIMS

REVISED AND ENLARGED

BY

E. J. V. HUIGINN

PUBLISHED BY
THE AUTHOR
BEVERLY, MASSACHUSETTS


1914

Copyright

JAN -8 1915

©CL A391277

no.



The oil painting from which this is taken is owned in Plymouth, Mass. Some accept it as a picture of Standish made when he was in England in 1625-26. Others reject it. It is not mentioned in the inventory of his estate. It was found in England long after his death.

DEDICATION

It is with great pleasure I dedicate this volume to Mrs. Russell Sage, who has very kindly granted me her permission to do so. Mrs. Sage is herself a descendant of Myles Standish of Plymouth. Mrs. Sage's father was Joseph Slocum, who was the son of Olivia Josselyn, who was the daughter of Olivia Standish, who was the daughter of David Standish, who was the son of Thomas Standish, who was the son of Alexander Standish, who was the eldest surviving son of Captain Myles Standish.

It is owing to Mrs. Sage's generosity that this book now appears.

Though a stranger to the Pilgrims in many ways, I was not a stranger to them in sympathy, hope, and life, and I have always considered it a great happiness to have been able to add a little to what my predecessors had done in trying to preserve their memory. It was a work of affection, and I am glad to have the opportunity of dedicating this work to a descendant of the Captain of the Pilgrims, who is in herself an epitome of the highest ideals of the Plymouth forefathers.

E.J.V.H.



CONTENTS


	PAGE
CHAPTER I	
Where was Standish buried? Eight theories about the place	13
CHAPTER II	
Mr. Justin Winsor's History of Duxbury and his hypotheses. Analysis of his evidence	17
CHAPTER III	
Standish buried in Duxbury.	29
CHAPTER IV	
Location of first meeting-house and cemetery. Proofs from locations of roads, homesteads, etc. The homes of the first three ministers. Evidence from original documents	33
CHAPTER V	
Original documents and first and second meeting-houses. Committee appointed to build second meeting-house. Second meeting-house built	54
CHAPTER VI	
The theory about the Chandler farm. The first roads in Duxbury	66
CHAPTER VII	
More about the roads. No highway to Chandler farm. Remains found on Chandler farm; of what evidential value.	74
CHAPTER VIII	
Two Cushman houses. Three Mrs. Cushmans. Dr. Wadsworth's testimony. The Ryder farm theory	82

CONTENTS

CHAPTER IX	PAGE
The two triangular stones. The tradition about them as stated by Mr. Winsor and others. Witnesses to the tradition. Mrs. Ruth Standish Hall's testimony. Dr. John Wadsworth's testimony further considered. Value of his testimony	94
CHAPTER X	
Mrs. Ruth Standish Hall and Benjamin Prior's testimony. The Prior tradition about Standish's grave. The Brewster tradition. The Faunce tradition	109
CHAPTER XI	
Original witnesses and their descendants	113
CHAPTER XII	
The graves. Mr. Melzar Brewster and the Duxbury Rural Society. Mr. Brewster finds the triangular pyramids. Two graves opened and the remains of an elderly man and a young woman found. The first five deaths in Standish's family. Five graves opened in 1891. Remains of five bodies found corresponding to first five deaths in Standish's family. Condition of remains. Remarkable formation of skulls	118
CHAPTER XIII	
The two girls and the two boys buried before Standish's death. Lora's age. "Plimoths great book." The two boys of the same name. Governor Bradford's evidence. Ages of Standish's children	130
CHAPTER XIV	
Age of Josias Standish and his wife, Mary Dingley. The Dingley family. Mary's death	146
CHAPTER XV	
Complications in dates explained	150
CHAPTER XVI	
Captain Standish's age. Officer in English army—when?	152
CHAPTER XVII	
Objections to our conclusions	155

CONTENTS

CHAPTER XVIII	PAGE
Mrs. Jane G. Austin's objections. When was Duxbury settled?	161
 CHAPTER XIX	
Mrs. Austin's objections. The remarkable triangular stones. Supposed destruction of Duxbury records. The first church in Duxbury—when built? The first church in Plymouth—when built? Elder Brewster never minister in Duxbury. Standish's grave and the Indians and Pequot War. John Alden's burial place. Major Alden's theory	172
 CHAPTER XX	
Elder Brewster and Mrs. Brewster. The Brewster Diary. Mrs. Brewster buried in Plymouth. The Elder's burial place. A remarkable grave in Duxbury . . .	188
 CHAPTER XXI	
The Captain's will	193
 CHAPTER XXII	
Standish's religion	197
 CHAPTER XXIII	
Letters to the author	205
 CHAPTER XXIV	
Memorial at the Graves. List of subscribers and Treasurer's report. Letters from the Navy Department. Standishes of Salem and Lynn and of Wethersfield, Connecticut. The reputed painting of the Captain in Plymouth, and its consequences if genuine and if dates are correct	209
Standish's Grave—Before	216
Standish's Grave—After	217-218



REFERENCES FOR THE MAP

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. Captain's Hill, site of Standish Monument. | G. Bayley's Corner. |
| B. Mrs. Thomas Chandler's. | H. Hall's Corner. |
| C. Morton's Hole. | K. Harden Hill. |
| D. George F. Ryder's. | L. Present Graveyard in use since 1783. |
| E. Graveyard where Standish is buried. | M. Mill Brook, on road to Duck Hill and Marshfield. |

THE GRAVES OF MYLES STANDISH AND OTHER PILGRIMS

CHAPTER I

I went to live in Duxbury, Massachusetts, in 1890. I was the first resident minister of the Protestant Episcopal Church in that town, having accepted the charge of the Mission of St. John the Evangelist. Many of my parishioners were descendants of the Pilgrims, not a few claiming descent from Standish, and Brewster, and Bradford, and Alden, not to mention others. It was most interesting to me to find myself in such surroundings. What would the good old Pilgrims have said to a resident Episcopal minister, and his black and white gowns, and book of prayer? I had a feeling that if they came back to Duxbury, they would not have treated me as a stranger, an outsider. I loved them and the places they hallowed. You may call them religious rebels if you will, but even so, I felt strangely at one with them.

It is not to be wondered at, then, that I tried in every way to gather the traditions and stories about the past glory of Duxbury,

14 THE GRAVES OF MYLES STANDISH

—for it certainly had a glorious past,—and to find all the traces possible of its original settlers, their homes, their meeting-house, their schools, and all other things pertaining to their life. It was very easy to locate the sites of the homes of Standish, Brewster, and Alden, and of others of the Pilgrims, but I must confess that my chief interest was in the three men I have named.

One great drawback to all my pleasure in my surroundings was that no one could definitely point out to me the last resting-places of Duxbury's most famous men. I felt that their burial places could be located if proper steps were taken to do so, and I made up my mind to try and locate them. I lived in the home of Dr. Wilfred G. Brown, the only physician then resident in Duxbury, and now living in Plymouth, Massachusetts. Dr. Brown was quite as much interested as I was, and he helped me to collect traditions from some of his patients. Everywhere I went I almost became an interrogation point seeking for news about the Pilgrims. In this way I gathered many differing stories, but little in the way of proof.

Having collected all I could from oral tradition, I got Justin Winsor's History of Duxbury and read it with the greatest care, watching closely for every reference to a cemetery, a meeting-house, public lands, highways, paths, boundaries of farms, especial-

ly of those near the meeting-house grounds, and more especially of those of the first three ministers of Duxbury, Partridge, Holmes, and Wiswall, who held the ministry of the town of Duxbury from 1637 to 1700.

The authority of Justin Winsor was final with, I daresay, most people. He was a Duxbury boy, became Librarian of Harvard College, and was one of the notable New England historians of his time. The Duxbury people would not easily tolerate it, that a rank outsider after a short residence in town should try to overthrow Mr. Winsor's statements. I knew this, and I resolved not to put myself in the attitude of antagonism to Mr. Winsor if I could possibly avoid so doing.

From the various stories I had collected one had a choice of several places for Standish's grave.

1. Some said he went to England, and died and was buried there.

2. Some said he was buried in Connecticut.

3. Some said he was buried in Plymouth.

4. Some said he was buried on his own farm.

5. Some said he was buried at a place in Duxbury called Harden Hill.

6. Some said he was buried on a farm owned by Mr. George Frank Ryder.

7. Others said he was buried on a

piece of land lying west of Morton's Hole Marsh and south of Border Street, on a little bit of land on the edge of the bay, which land belonged to Mrs. Thomas Chandler.

8. Others, and these the ones likely to have the best information, said that Standish was buried in the old cemetery near Hall's Corner, and that the first meeting-house was there.

CHAPTER II

It is not surprising, then, that some people considered it hopeless to try and discover the real burial place of the Captain. If one were to get beyond guesses and probabilities, he would have to collect all the evidence from every source and let it tell its own story. So I began the task of examining the evidence presented by Mr. Winsor in his *History of Duxbury*.

Mr. Winsor says in his *History*, pages 53, 176, 177, 179, 183:—

“No stone marks the resting place of his ashes and we must seek in vain the place where reposes what was mortal of the immortal Standish. He was probably, however, buried on his farm, or perhaps in the old burying-ground in that vicinity at Harden Hill.”

When speaking of the death of the Rev. Ralph Partridge, the first minister of Duxbury, Mr. Winsor says that he was “probably interred in the first burial place of the town which was a knoll in the south-eastern part at Harden Hill, as it is called. If any stones were ever placed here they have since been destroyed by the ravages of time or otherwise as none at the present time exist. Probably, however, none were

erected, in hopes of concealing from the Indians their loss by death, and consequent weakness; or in the earliest periods the difficulty of procuring stones from England was so great that few if any could have been placed here.

"This was probably used as a place of sepulture for about sixty years and here were doubtless buried most of the founders of the town and church. Here probably rest the remains of Standish, Alden, Collier, Partridge and others, whose memory we delight to cherish but whose graves must forever remain unknown.

"We have the most positive evidence that there was a burying-ground here. Some years ago while a sloop was building in this vicinity, there were found the bones of a female and an infant buried together. About the close of the century a small sloop grounded on the marsh near by in a severe gale, and a party of workmen proceeded to get her off. While here they discovered in the bank lately washed by the sea, the appearance of a coffin, and on closer examination they perceived the nails, though all were in a very decayed state. On the shore beneath there were found three skulls and several bones, apparently of the thigh. The teeth in one were perfect and in one there were two. On one there was some light sandy hair. The bank here was washed away

some twenty feet within fifty years. Some, however, incline to the belief that this was an Indian yard, but the fact that it was near the first church and other considerations influence me to believe that it was an English burial place. There were, fifty or seventy years ago, traditional reports that there was a burying-ground a short distance to the west of the Methodist Episcopal church, and Esquire Sprague, when plowing, used always on that account to leave undisturbed this portion. Major Alden was accustomed to observe that he believed John Alden, the Pilgrim, was buried here and that this was the first burying-ground, and the one at Harden Hill cliff was an Indian one. However, there is no positive evidence on this point either way.

"Mr. Partridge preached in a very small building in the south-eastern part of the town near the water, and tradition now marks its site. This building probably stood for about seventy years and in it preached the first three pastors of the church."

I would draw your attention to these extracts from Mr. Winsor's book.

1. He says "we must seek in vain" for Standish's burial place.

2. He says that Standish "was probably buried on his farm or perhaps in the old burying-ground in that vicinity at Harden Hill."

3. He says the first minister, Partridge was "probably interred in the first burial place of the town which was a knoll in the south-eastern part at Harden Hill."

4. He says that this Harden Hill burial place was used for about sixty years, and that "here were doubtless buried most of the founders of the town and church. Here probably rest the remains of Standish, Alden, Collier, Partridge and others, whose memory we delight to cherish but whose graves must forever remain unknown."

5. He speaks of some bones found on the water-front of Harden Hill, as proof that a burial-place was there, and then says that some declared this to be an Indian burial place, but that he felt that, as "it was near the first church," it was an English burial place.

6. He mentions the belief of Esquire Sprague about an ancient burial-place west of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and Major Alden's belief that John Alden was buried here. This Methodist Episcopal Church is now the Protestant Episcopal Church. Before I left Duxbury I opened communication with the presiding elder of the Methodist Episcopal Church of the District in which Duxbury was situated, asking if the Methodist Church would dispose of their property in Duxbury to the Protestant Episcopal Mission in Duxbury, and I received a reply that the Methodists would

gladly transfer the property on certain conditions and the payment of a nominal sum of twenty-five dollars. This arrangement was carried out after I left Duxbury.

7. Mr. Winsor says there "is no positive evidence either way," as to whether there was an English burial place where Esquire Sprague and Major Alden located one, nor as to their belief that the Harden Hill burial place was an Indian one.

8. Finally Mr. Winsor says that "Mr. Partridge preached in a very small building in the south-eastern part of the town near the water and tradition now marks its site. This building probably stood for about seventy years and in it preached the first three pastors of the church."

9. On page 183, Mr. Winsor says: "The Second church stood at the easterly end of this yard where its site is now identified, and was probably erected in the latter part of Mr. W.'s ministry," or, he adds, "somewhat later." As will be shown, we found the record of the building of this second church, and that it was "within three or four rods" of the first one.

It is easily seen that Mr. Winsor had not much definite information concerning the first meeting-house and the first burial place of the town. Very evidently he did not read the Duxbury and Plymouth records.

You will remark that he says "probably" Standish was buried on his farm, or "perhaps" on Harden Hill, and again says, "probably" he was buried on Harden Hill and finally says the first church was near Harden Hill, and therefore there was a burying-ground there and an English one at that. Mr. Winsor's facts and conjectures were hastily gathered when he was a young man (about eighteen years of age) on his vacation in Duxbury. He had, at that time, no training in antiquarian or archæological researches, or he would have seen that in his own book he has the most convincing evidence to prove that all these conjectures are groundless as to the site of the old church and the old graveyard in Duxbury.

Harden Hill lies on the south-easterly coast of Duxbury Bay, north of the creek known as Simmons' Creek, and opposite or nearly opposite the home of Mr. Ira Chandler, who lives on the Nook road. Harden Hill is at present occupied by Mr. William Freeman (whose place [A.D. 1892,] is owned by Mr. Theodore Freeman), Mr. Edgar Smith, Mr. Edward Marsh, Mr. Gamaliel Wadsworth, and Mr. Calvin Smith. The very situation of this hill would show that the early settlers never would have selected it for the site of a church or for a graveyard. It was removed from every settler in the town. There was no public road to it; in

all the records of public roads there is no mention of a road to Harden Hill, nor is there the least reference to a meeting-house there. Now if the meeting-house were there, there would be a public highway to it, for the meeting-house was used for all town meetings as well as for church purposes. There is no reference in the deeds and records of the farms in that vicinity to a meeting-house as a boundary. The hill was altogether remote from the centre of population. The Nook people, in order to reach the meeting-house, would have to cross the marshes lying at the back of Mr. Sylvanus Sampson's, or they would have to go around by some public way. There is no public way mentioned in any of the deeds of farms, or in any of the bounds of farms, recorded for those early times. Besides, the settlers whose farms are recorded as lying around the first meeting-house all lived round Hall's Corner, near what is known as the old cemetery on the road between Hall's Corner and Bayley's Corner. To place a meeting-house on a hill remote from all the settlers in all parts of the town would be an absurdity too great to lay to the sense of the distinguished men who founded Duxbury and established a church here. All the settlers about the place known as Powder Point, and in all the other parts of the town around John Alden's homestead, and around Mill Brook and Duck Hill, would

object to putting a meeting-house in such an out-of-the-way place.

As to the supposed graveyard at Harden Hill, there are no traces of any public graveyard there. Excavations were made on the hill by several people, and there was not a trace of a graveyard, a common graveyard. According to Mr. Winsor, Harden Hill was used as a graveyard by the people of Duxbury for sixty years at least. That is, it was used as a graveyard until about 1690, A.D. There are public records that a large number of people died in Duxbury before that time. Besides, the Wadsworth records state that eighty-four persons had died in Duxbury up to 1688, A.D. Now it would be impossible to bury such a number of people in a graveyard on Harden Hill and at this date find no trace of such a number of graves. Again, it would be impossible for such a graveyard to be washed away by the sea and the people of the town not to know it.

Every week the people were at their divine service; over and over again they carried their dead there; frequently they must have visited the graves of their former friends; their town-meetings were held in the meeting-house, and all public business was transacted in it; for all these reasons and many others that will suggest themselves, the people of Duxbury would have had many and ample opportunities for observing the destruction

of their graveyard by the tides, and such destruction could not have taken place without their knowledge.

As to the bones that were found on Harden Hill, the belief was that they were Indian bones, until Mr. Justin Winsor stated in his book that they were Caucasian bones, from the fact that this supposed graveyard "was near the first church." That it was not near the first church is absolutely certain, even according to Mr. Winsor's facts. The foundation for his supposition is gone and the supposition vanishes.

It is not necessary that we should account for the bones found on Harden Hill, for they do not in any sense correspond with what history, tradition, and Standish's own will, require to prove that they were the bones of the Standish family. However, there are many ways of accounting for these bones. They may have been Indian bones. They may have been the bones of what were known as praying Indians, that is of Indians who became Christians and lived on friendly terms with the colonists. They may have been the remains of some shipwrecked people. They may have been the remains of some people who for some reason were buried on their own land; it is certain that this land was never town land in the sense that it was used for a public cemetery; it is also certain that it never belonged to Standish or any of

his descendants. Indeed these remains may have been the remains of some negro slaves, for in the old days some slaves were owned in the town. It must be kept in mind that Duxbury was at one time quite a sea-port, and that a line of wharves and ship-building establishments lined this coast, and that sailors came from many lands in the old days; there was a wharf in more recent times at Harden Hill; it would be easy to find conjectures enough to explain the presence of the remains found at Harden Hill. But it is hardly necessary to conjecture about them. The most likely thing of all is that these remains were of the several people who were executed in the town in its early years.

Richard Bushup lived with Love Brewster. Richard Bushup was married on 5th December, 1644, to Alice Clark. This Alice Clark, wife of Bushup, was hanged in 1648 for the murder of her child.

Love Brewster seems to have had his share of undesirable people about him. A servant of his, Thomas Graunger, was hanged in 1642 for "a capital offence."

John Drew, a Welshman and ship-carpenter, came to Plymouth; he had five sons, three of whom settled in Plymouth and two in Duxbury. Samuel, one of these sons, whose home was in Duxbury, having taken too much liquor while on board a shallop in 1678, fell into the water and was drowned.

Besides, we know that there were Quakers in the town in 1660. We know that the second John Alden was accused of witchcraft. We know that there were religious dissenters in the town almost from the first days, that is, some who did not agree with the Pilgrims in their religious views. Later, there were Universalists. Over and above all these facts, it is certain that some people, "excommunicated" or otherwise separated from the local church, may have buried their dead in private places. Harden Hill may be one of these places.

The bones found were the skeletons of a woman and a child buried with her, "three skulls and several bones apparently of the thigh. The teeth in one were perfect, and in one there were two. On one there was some light sandy hair." The woman and the child may have been Alice Bushup, and her child. The other skulls were probably of the other persons who at various times were put to death or were buried apart for special reasons. There are, as I have said, records of three or four early executions. The swamp-encircled sand-hill would have been a retired place in which to bury such people.

That these bones could not have been the remains of the Standish family is evident. Neither Lora nor Mary Standish was buried with a child. These two young women

were buried near each other. The Captain was buried near them. All agree that they were buried in the graveyard attached to the church. Those who would bury the Captain at Harden Hill, or on the farm of Mrs. Thomas Chandler, claim that the first church was in one or the other place respectively. On Harden Hill no two young women were found near an old man. No two remarkable pyramidal stones were found marking the place. No tradition in the oldest families supported the notion that there ever were a graveyard and a church on Harden Hill. There never was a public road leading to Harden Hill, and the public roads all led to the meeting-house. There never was any town-land on Harden Hill. The church, and the pound, and the stocks, were always placed on the town-land and in a convenient place on the highways. The farms, bounded with reference to the old church, are all located near Hall's Corner and towards Bayley's Corner around the old cemetery in that vicinity.

We shall again refer to Mr. Winsor's great mistake in locating the meeting-house on Harden Hill, and out of his own book we shall prove his mistake.

CHAPTER III

Before proceeding farther in the examination of the evidence for the hypothetical places of Standish's burial, we shall eliminate all those places which have been mentioned except Duxbury.

We know that Standish died between the 7th March, 1655, the date of his will, and the 4th May, 1657, when his will was exhibited in the court at Plymouth and recorded. We are told that Standish died on the 3d October, 1656. He could not have died before 1656, for he was appointed one of the assistants to the governor that year.

Captain Standish was a prosecutor against Richard Sparrow of Eastham, in a case set for 5th October, 1656, at Plymouth Court, according to the Old Colony records. Standish was acting in behalf of Elizabeth Hopkins.

At his death in 1656 Standish was the chief military officer. He was "a man full of years and honored by his generation."

Nathaniel Morton, the secretary of the Colony from 1645 to 1685, tells us of Standish: "He growing very ancient became sick of the stone or strangullion, whereof after his suffer-

ing of much dolorous pain, he fell asleep in the Lord and was honorably buried at Duxbury."

Nathaniel Morton was the son of George Morton who came in the Ann in 1623; George had married the sister of Governor Bradford. Nathaniel was born in 1612 and died in 1685. He was secretary of the Colony for forty years. He was also secretary of the united colonies, the compiler of valuable church records, now in existence, from the origin of the Leyden church, and author of the New England Memorial. In a copy of the Memorial in the library of the Massachusetts Historical Society and which belonged to Governor Prince, Mr. Prince wrote in the margin the following note, from which we determine the day of Standish's death, which is not recorded elsewhere. The portions in brackets are gone and are supplied from conjecture. "In ye list at ye e[nd] of Gour. Bradford's MSS Folio tis writ yt Capt. Standish died Oct. 3, 1655. But his son Wm's Table Book says Oct. 3, 1656 and Capt. Standish being chosen assist[ant] in 1656 shoves that his death must [have occurred in this last year.]"

From this evidence, and from Standish's will, and Governor Prince's copy of the Memorial, we see that Standish died in 1656, and from Morton's evidence we see that he was honorably buried in Duxbury. In his

will he speaks of his burial place: "My will is that out of my whole estate my funeral charges to be taken out, and my body to be buried in a decent manner, and if I die in Duxburrow, my body to be laid as near as conveniently may be to my two dear daughters Lora Standish, my daughter, and Mary Standish, my daughter-in-law." History, written and traditional, records that Standish was buried in Duxbury.

That he was buried honorably is proved by the words of Nathaniel Morton, and by the position the Captain occupied at his death as the chief military officer of the Colony. There was no secrecy about the funeral. If he was, as Morton says, honorably buried, he must have been buried with due public pomp and ceremony and with manifestations of public sorrow. The notion that he was buried secretly on account of the Indians is the suggestion of those who believed that his grave could not be discovered. There was no necessity for concealing his death from the Indians. When Standish died the Indians were on friendly terms with the colonists. From 1637 to 1675 there was peace between the Indians and the settlers. At Standish's death there was peace. The Indians must have known of his death. Many Indians resided in the town, and we know that in 1656 there were "praying" Indians, that is believers in Christianity.

But even granting that Standish was buried secretly on account of the Indians, how will this prove that the settlers themselves, his brothers in arms, his friends, his neighbors, his children, did not know of his death and his last resting place?

Standish speaks in his will of the burial place of his children as a well known place. He asks to be buried with them. Without doubt he was buried with them, and with due pomp. His old soldiers must have come to his funeral. The mothers of the Colony must have spoken of his death and burial place. They could not forget the brave man who so often risked his own life for theirs and their children's.

Does anyone think that Morton would have said that Standish was honorably buried, if Morton knew that he had been secretly buried? Would Morton not have mentioned that he was secretly buried when writing of the funeral?

CHAPTER IV

It is now plain that Standish was buried in Duxbury, and we thus limit the question to the place in Duxbury.

You will observe that Mr. Winsor says the first meeting-house in Duxbury stood for about sixty years, and in another place he says it stood for about seventy years. He says the first burying-place was near the first meeting-house, and he gives this as his argument for locating the first burying-place of the English colonists at Harden Hill. He says that the first three ministers, Partridge, Holmes, and Wiswall, preached in the first meeting-house. He says that Standish, Alden, Collier, Partridge, and others of the colonists, were buried in the first graveyard near the first meeting-house. He locates the second church at the eastern corner of the cemetery near Hall's Corner. There are two of these statements which are not wholly correct. The first meeting-house stood for about seventy years, not sixty. This first meeting-house and the burying-ground in its vicinity were not at Harden Hill, as we shall plainly show, even from Mr. Winsor's own book, but precisely where the records prove them to have been, between Hall's Corner and Bayley's Corner, where the graves

are marked, and the site of the first meeting-house is designated by a boulder. The second meeting-house was within three or four rods of the first one.

Had Mr. Winsor adverted to what he has on page 183 of his "History of Duxbury," he would not have adopted the Harden Hill theory. Speaking of the parsonage given to Mr. Wiswall in 1694, Mr. Winsor says: "In 1694, we find the first mention of a parsonage when a committee was appointed to give Mr. W. a deed of the 'towne house, and the land he now lives on. At this time the town granted him half ye meadow called Rouse's meadow, yt belonged to ye ministry, to him and his heirs forever, and ye use of yt whole his lifetime.' The house above named was built by the Rev. John Holmes, on land he purchased of John Sprague, and was situated west of the road leading from the meeting-house into the Nook or Capt. Standish's point, containing about five or eight acres. The house was afterward sold by Major William Bradford, who married the widow of Mr. Holmes, to the town."

From the location of this house built by Mr. Holmes, it was easy for Mr. Winsor to perceive that this house lying west of the road leading from the meeting-house into the Nook, the meeting-house could not have been on Harden Hill. To reach the Nook from a supposed meeting-house on Harden

Hill, you would have to go west until you met the road leading from the mill at Mill Brook to Morton's Hole. The main road was from the Nook to the mill, and a road running at right angles, or nearly so, would lead from this main road to the supposed meeting-house on Harden Hill. This latter would be the meeting-house road proper, for the one from the Nook to the mill was known as the road from the Nook to the mill. As a matter of fact the meeting-house was on the western side of the main road from the Nook to the mill, and so this road was also called the road from the meeting-house to the mill, and the road from the meeting-house to the Nook; it is also called in the old records the road from Morton's Hole to Ducksburrow town. It took its designation indiscriminately from the three important places on it, the Nook, the meeting-house, and the mill. A farm west of the road leading from the meeting-house to the Nook could not be at Harden Hill. Here then Mr. Winsor had proof that his conjecture, that for seventy years the first church was on Harden Hill, was wrong.

On the same page of his History of Duxbury, 183, Mr. Winsor continues directly after the words quoted: "At the same time they gave him (Mr. Wiswall) one half of Bump's meadow, and the old pasture bounded northeast by the before mentioned house

lot, N. west by Mr. Ralph Thacher's homestead; southwest by Morton's Hole marsh; and southeast by Thomas Boney's." It will be seen, then, that the homestead of Rev. John Holmes given by the town to Mr. Wiswall was the northeast boundary of this other piece of land given to Mr. Wiswall, which was bounded on the southwest by Morton's Hole marsh. By looking at the map of the town Mr. Winsor could have at once determined where Rev. Mr. Wiswall's home was, where Rev. Mr. Holmes' home was, and where the Rev. Mr. Partridge's home was. The three are mentioned in this paragraph giving the boundaries of this piece of land given to Mr. Wiswall. From the position of the marsh at Morton's Hole, and from the location of the two pieces of land given to Mr. Wiswall, one the Holmes homestead, and the reference to the road from the meeting-house into the Nook as the eastern boundary of the above homestead, we can easily show that the meeting-house was not on Harden Hill. The evidence all proves that it was at the present old cemetery between Hall's and Bayley's Corners.

Mr. Ralph Thacher, whose name is mentioned in the last boundaries, was the grandson of Rev. Ralph Partridge, and occupied the homestead of his grandfather, which came to him through his mother, a daughter of Mr. Partridge. Mr. Partridge's will was exhibited

in court the 4th May, 1658, by Mr. William Collier. He leaves all his landed estate, his homestead in Duxbury—in all 190 acres,—besides land he had purchased at Bridgewater, to his daughter Elizabeth Thacher and then to her second son, Ralph. Here we see the homes of the first three ministers, Partridge, Holmes, and Wiswall, almost beside the old cemetery, between Hall's and Bayley's Corners; Partridge's was adjoining the cemetery, and all of them west of the road running from the meeting-house to the Nook, and as we might say in the words of the record, lying "on the head of Morton's Hole."

Now here was a meeting-house, in Mr. Holmes's time, placed not at Harden Hill, but on "the head of Morton's Hole," and here were the homes of the first three ministers lying west of the road going from the meeting-house to the Nook. I need not dwell upon the likelihood that the minister's home would be near the meeting-house. But it is not necessary to dwell on conjectures and likelihoods. We prefer to deal with facts.

If the meeting-house were at the "head of Morton's Hole" in Mr. Holmes's time, and he died in 1675, it is at once certain that it was not for seventy years at Harden Hill.

It is certain that in 1630, if not before that time, some of the chief Pilgrims had come to live in Duxbury. Some say that they had come to Duxbury as early as 1626 or 1627.

The Aldens claim that the first Alden house in Duxbury was built in 1627, and they have erected a tablet of that date on the supposed site. However, be this as it may, it is generally agreed that a settlement was made in Duxbury in 1630. In the winter time the settlers returned to Plymouth. The following document throws light on the point:

"Ano 1632 } The names of those which
 Aprell 2 } promise to remove their fam-
 [ilies] to live in the towne in the winter time,
 that they m[ay] the better repair to the
 worship of God.

John Alden,
 Capt. Standish,
 Jonathan Brewster,
 Thomas Prence."

The removal to Plymouth in the winter was not required a year or two later. "In the year 1632, a number of the brethren inhabiting on the other side of the bay, at a place since called Duxborough, growing weary of attending the worship of God from such distance asked and were granted a dismission." All agree that about this time the people of Duxbury were released from the obligation of attending service in Plymouth. There was not a settled pastor in Duxbury until Rev. Ralph Partridge came in 1637. We know that Mr. Partridge came to Duxbury in 1637, for there is a deed of

land to him dated 1637, June 29th. He came from England in 1636, landing in November. The Rev. Nathaniel Rogers of Ipswich came in the same ship. They were twenty-four weeks on the water. The first church was built in Duxbury between 1632 and 1638.

This first meeting-house, Mr. Winsor says, stood for about seventy years, and in it ministered the first three pastors. But Mr. Winsor is not certain of its location, nor is he absolutely certain when the second was built. It was built a few years after Mr. Wiswall's death, as we shall see. All agree there was but one church before the one built in the beginning of the eighteenth century. Tradition and history are at one in saying that the church built at the old cemetery in the beginning of the eighteenth century was the second church built in the town.

From continual references to the meeting-house it will be seen that there was a meeting-house in the town as early as 1638, A.D.

In the year 1638 it was recorded that A. Sampson was presented to the court "for striking and abusing John Washburn, the younger, in the meeting-house on the Lord's day."

In 1641 there were eight churches in Plymouth Colony and the Duxbury church was one of them.

In 1651 Nathaniel Bassett and Jo. Prior were fined twenty shillings each for disturbing the church, "and at the next town meeting or training day, each to be bound to a post for two hours in some public place, with a paper on their heads, on which their crime was to be written in capital letters."

In 1652 George Russell was fined for not attending church in "the liberties" of Duxbury.

In 1666 Edward Laud, John Cooper, and John Simmons were fined ten shillings each for "prophane and abusive carriages, each toward the other on Lord's day at the meeting-house."

In 1669 "it was enacted that any person or persons that shall be found smoking of tobacco on the Lord's day, going to or coming from the meetings within two miles of the meeting-house, shall pay twelve pence for every such default for the colony's use."

In 1670 the meeting-house is mentioned in the boundaries of Joseph Prior's land.

In 1672 the meeting-house is mentioned in the bounds of Rev. Mr. Holmes's land.

In 1684 on the 10th September Joseph Prior, Junr, was paid one shilling for mending the pulpit door.

In 1686 Rhodolphus Thacher was paid ten shillings for sweeping the meeting-house.

In 1690 Deacon Wadsworth received ten shillings for sweeping the meeting-house.

In 1692 Mr. Wadsworth received ten shillings for sweeping the meeting-house.

In 1692 Mr. Southworth's bill was balanced for repairing Mr. Wiswall's house and for glassing the meeting-house.

In 1693 Mr. Wadsworth was paid fifteen shillings for sweeping the meeting-house.

In 1694 it is mentioned in the boundaries of Mr. Wiswall's land.

In 1698 on the 23d May, the selectmen were ordered to have the gutters of the meeting-house repaired.

In 1699 the meeting-house is mentioned in the boundaries of Joseph Chandler's land.

In 1706 on Thursday, the 21st February, the town gave liberty to Benjamin Prior to remove the fence between the meeting-house and his own house, up to the road.

In 1705-6, the 20th March, the town-meeting was adjourned to the 3d April following to consider some way to raise funds for repairing and enlarging their meeting-house.

In 1706 on the 3d of April it was resolved to build a new meeting-house.

All these evidences, and others might be added, prove that there was a meeting-house in the town from 1638 at least. Finally it became so out of repair and so inadequate to accommodate the people that they decided to consider how to repair and enlarge it, and voted to sell it and build a new one.

From what has been said it is clear that the meeting-house was north of Morton's Hole. The direction of the highways and the location of the farms already mentioned place the meeting-house in that place. Now it makes no difference whether you assert there was only one, or whether there were two, or three, or more, churches built before 1706-7. The deeds of farms and the records of the roads locate the meeting-house, whether it was the first, or second, or third, or any other number, north of Morton's Hole. Around it were the farms and homes of the ministers from the beginning as we shall now see.

And first of all as to Mr. Partridge.

Mr. Partridge's land was granted to him around Morton's Hole. He was minister of the town, and it was right and natural that his land should be near the meeting-house, and this was so. In the Plymouth Colony Records in the book of Deeds, we find the following entry:

"We whose names are hereunder written, by order of Mr. Thomas Prince and Mr. William Collier assistant, have measured and layed out ten acres of arable land lying on the head of Morton's Hole, viz., one acre in breadth and ten acres in length lying in a square, the south side butting upon the garden plot of Edward Hall, the west side running into Christopher Wadsworth's

lot, the east side upon the highway and the north side upon the common ground, which we allotted and have layed out for Mr. Ralph Partridge, the 30th of December, 1637.

Jonathan Brewster,
Stephen Tracye,
Christopher Wadsworth."

From this we know that Mr. Partridge's land was east of Christopher Wadsworth's, west of the road from the Nook to the Mill, and south of the common lands. The records of the town tell us that some of the common land lay near where the old burying ground is, between Hall's and Bayley's Corners. We know, too, that Mr. Partridge built his home there, for in the boundaries of the land given to Rev. Mr. Wiswall, of which we have already spoken, there is mention of Ralph Thacher's homestead as the north-western boundary of the land bounded on the north-east by the house lot of Rev. John Holmes, and on the south-west by Morton's Hole marsh. Mr. Thacher, having inherited his grandfather's property in Duxbury, lived here for some time, but was afterward ordained minister in charge of a parish elsewhere. Mr. Partridge's homestead, then, was near the church and the churchyard at the head of Morton's Hole.

Mr. Partridge bought several pieces of land around this plot of ten acres assigned to him by the town. In the Old Colony

Records, Deeds, Volume 1, page 216, there is a record of land that Partridge bought of Job Cole in 1651. This land lay against Morton's Hole. Again on page 96 it is stated that he bought land of Christopher Wadsworth in 1643; this land lay north of Job Cole's land. Again on page 54 we are told that in 1639 he bought twenty acres of land of William Latham.

In the records of June 29, 1637, we are told that William Bassett and Francis Sprague both sold land to Ralph Partridge. The book of Deeds says the above two parcels of land are bounded "to the land of the said Francis Sprague to the south; to the land of the said Wm. Bassett to the east; to the houselot of Mr. William Leverich now layed forth for him to the north; toward the land of Christopher Wadsworth to the west." On Sept. 7, 1637, at page 25 in Plymouth Colony Records, Deeds, it is said that William Bassett gave to "Raph Partrich" of "Ducksburrow" land, which by word of mouth he had given to William Leverich at Duxbury.

These parcels of land we see were also near Hall's Corner, being a part of Sprague' and Bassett's land at that place. They lay near Morton's Hole.

It is well to observe that the land given to Mr. Partridge by the town, and the land he bought of Sprague and Bassett, were

bounded by Christopher Wadsworth's land on the west.

From the record it would seem to me, that there was not any meeting-house when this land was "laid out" by Brewster, Tracye, and Wadsworth, for Mr. Partridge, the first minister of the Duxbury church. It was "laid out" on the 30th December, 1637. It was "on the head of Morton's Hole." Its west side ran into Christopher Wadsworth's lot. The east side was on the highway. The north side was on the common grounds. In the later records of lands "laid out" to Mr. Holmes, to Mr. Wiswall, and others, the highway above referred to is the public highway leading from the meeting-house, over to Mill Brook, and down to the Captain's Nook. In the old days there was a gate, which is spoken of in the records, at the opening of the Nook, and without doubt it was the part of the road, within the gates, on the property of Standish and Brewster, which these two men were obliged to keep in repair, as the town refused to do so, and this road within the gates was only for their own use, as the Plymouth Records state. The part of the road between the meeting-house and the "gate of the Nook," was public property, as the public used it to reach the mouth of Morton's Hole, where a fishing-weir had been placed by order of the town in 1639.

We cite the record for the road within the gate of "the Noock." It is recorded in the Plymouth Colony Records, page 98, when Thomas Prince was Governor, in 1638, "whereas there was a highway laid forth through Captain Standish and Mr. William Brewster's ground on the Duxburrow side, which is not of use for the country and they do therefore refuse to repair the same, the said Captain Standish and Mr. Brewster do undertake to repair the said way and it to be only for their own use."

The land of Job Cole having been referred to, it may be said that Job Cole lived beside Morton's Hole. We have seen that Partridge bought some land from him. Mr. Cole, having removed to Eastham, sold to Christopher Wadsworth on August 13, 1651, "a house and land lying against a place called Morton's Hole," the meadow and fencing, etc., *Plym. Col. Records* — Deeds, p. 216.

The land of Edward Hall, mentioned as the southern boundary of the ten acres assigned to Partridge, was sold to William Wetherell on January 24, 1638. Wetherell paid Hall twenty pounds for his house and garden of two acres "lying between Ralph Partridge and Nicholas Robbins." *Plym. Col. Rec.*, p. 41.

From all these deeds and farm boundaries we can locate with considerable accuracy the relative position of the farms of

Wadsworth, Sprague, Bassett, Robbins, Partridge, Hall, and the others mentioned in these deeds. We can locate Partridge's home better than any of the others.

We have already seen where the Rev. John Holmes had his home, which was the house afterwards given by the town to Mr. Wiswall in 1694. There is a record that the town spent £21 repairing this house in 1693. This house was situated, as we have seen, on the head of Morton's Hole, but west of the road leading from the meeting-house into the Nook, and was built by Mr. Holmes when he came as minister in 1658.

In the preceding records we have frequent references to the meeting-house from 1638 to 1707. This is a period of sixty-nine years, in round numbers, seventy years.

To find these references was not an easy task. From my experience with Mr. Winsor's quotations from the records, I felt convinced that there must be many references to the meeting-house and to the roads leading to it in the boundaries of farms, in the old records of Duxbury and Plymouth, references that had either never been sought or completely overlooked. I went to Mr. George H. Stearns, the clerk of the town of Duxbury, and asked if I might have the liberty to read the old records of the town. This was readily granted. I read these records for the first one hundred years, and copied out

all the references I could find to the meeting-house, the public roads, the boundaries of farms with reference to the meeting-house, the meeting-house grounds, the homes of the first three ministers, and all other matters I thought might shed light on the subject in hand. It was thus I found many of the references used in the effort to locate Standish's burial place.

I next went to Plymouth and followed up the early records there in the same manner, finding helpful material there as well as in Duxbury.

I may be permitted to say that the town clerk of Duxbury told me that I was the only person he knew who ever had taken the trouble thoroughly to examine the old records of Duxbury.

It may not be out of place to say that the old books of records of Duxbury were in a bad shape when I saw them. Indeed, it is a wonder the books were in existence. No care was taken to keep them in a dry or fire-proof place, and yet these records were and are of the greatest interest to all New England, and, indeed, to all who are interested in the beginnings of a nation. I brought the matter to the attention of the next town-meeting and urged the necessity of having the old records—some of them like little "pass-books," or pocket record-books, which I found full of dampness and decay,—placed

in the hands of properly skilled persons with a view to treatment for their preservation. I also urged a fire-proof vault for the records. The old records, when I first saw them, were kept in a small, plain wooden box. The town-meeting voted \$300.00 to have parts of the old records copied, and ordered that steps be taken to have the old books treated for preservation and kept in a safe place. I was asked to take charge of these matters, but requested that some others be associated with me. Very soon we had some of the records in the hands of a copyist, and at least parts of his copies were printed. A safe was provided, and the old records are now in a secure place.

In the Duxbury Records, I found the following, at page 223, date 24 June, 1670, in the small vellum-bound book: "Whereas, the town have appointed Mr. Constant Southworth and Phillip Delano, and William Pabodie to bound men's lands, We the above named, have ranged and bounded out unto Joseph Prior, ten acres of land lying between or beyond or towards the mill on the fresh marshes, as you go from the meeting-house to the mill, that path being the bounds on the East side," etc.

This record is subscribed, "Transcribed by me, William Pabodie, Clark."

The value of this record is to show that there was a meeting-house in 1670,—although

this has already been proved,—and that the road from the meeting-house to the mill was the Eastern boundary of this land. This is the same road mentioned in the following record of 24th June, 1672, in the same volume which reads:—

“Whereas Mr. Constant Southworth, Phillip Dillano, Senior, and Will. Pabodie were appointed by the town to bound out more lands, we the above named have bounded out to Mr. John Holmes ten acres of land bounded on the south by land of Joseph Prior and on the east end by the path that goes from the meeting-house to the mill and two marked trees, on the north side one white oak tree which stands about sixteen rods from the path and a pine tree 6 [rods] in the woods.” The words before the last three are, I think, contractions for “six rods.” The copyist of the Duxbury Records reads “and a pine tree up in the woods,” etc. The points to be observed in these records are: (1) that the meeting-house was in 1672 on a road passing to the mill; (2) that this road ran north and south, or else it could not have been the eastern boundary of the land given to Holmes. From this we easily conclude that the road referred to here is the road spoken of in 1637 as running from “Morton’s Hole to Ducksburrow Towne.” We know that the mill stood on Stony or Mill Brook, and that the road running north and south

in 1672 to the mill from the meeting-house was the old road of 1637. Then the location of Joseph Prior's farm at this place absolutely determines the location of Mr. Holmes's grant. Mr. Holmes died in 1675, three years after this reference to the meeting-house, and he was buried in the old graveyard at the meeting-house.

Already we have seen that Mr. Wiswall lived near Morton's Hole. From all these facts concerning the first three ministers, we know that they all lived near Morton's Hole, near the old cemetery, and naturally we would expect that they were near the meeting-house. All the facts prove this to have been so. We know that Wiswall was buried in the old cemetery, his tombstone being still well preserved. Holmes was buried in the old cemetery, Justin Winsor says. He says the same of Standish, Alden, and Partridge. Mr. Winsor being evidently wrong in his location of the first church, would, without doubt, grant that Standish, Alden, Partridge, Holmes, and all the other important men of the town, who were buried here, were buried in the cemetery wherever it was. He and all of us agree it was near the first church. From his own book we can prove that the first church was not at Harden Hill, but north of Morton's Hole. Therefore, Partridge was buried there.

Mather in his *Magnalia* tells us that

Partridge died in Duxbury, and we learn the same from all sources.

We shall quote from the record of a grant of land, which is recorded in the hand-writing of Alexander Standish, the 17th day of February 1699-700, and in which the meeting-house is mentioned. "Whereas formerly a tract of land was granted by the town of Duxburrow to Joseph Chandler, lying between the meeting-house road and Plymouth road, and was laid out to him but now no record to be found of it, we ensigne John Trasie, Thomas Delano and Abraham Sampson, being desired by Joseph Chandler, have layed out unto him twenty acres of land more or less bounded on the east by the meeting-house path to a red oak tree marked on four sides, and from said tree by a west southwest line to a pine tree which is the corner mark of the town's land and from the pine tree by the same line a range of trees marked until we come to a cart road where we marked a red oak sappling and then bounded by said path unto Plymouth road and by said road to the land of said Joseph Chandler and so by Joseph Chandler's line to the meeting-house path, this 17th day of February, 1699-700.

ALEXANDER STANDISH, Town Clerk.

John Trasie,
Thomas Delano,
Abraham Sampson."

The value of this record is to prove the location of the meeting-house on a road running north and south, and that this road was the eastern boundary for the land given to Joseph Chandler. This record, taken in connection with the location of Joseph Chandler's "lotted" land and the Plymouth road, will give us an idea of the situation of the land lying between "the meeting-house road and the Plymouth road." It is very plain then that the meeting-house path here mentioned could not have been one going to Harden Hill. This deed refers to a time before the second church or meeting-house was built.

CHAPTER V

From all these different facts we conclusively prove that the first meeting-house was, in fact all meeting-houses were, if you suppose two or more to have been in existence before 1706-7, located at the old cemetery. But we have still stronger and greater evidence.

On Thursday, the 7th of May, 1891, I was examining landmarks about the old cemetery in connection with the grave of Standish. I saw evident signs of two church sites on the ground.

I was not then so much surprised as pleased when I found the following entries in the old town records:—

“At a town’s meeting in Duxborough March, ye 20th 170 5-6 ye said meeting was adjourned to the third day of April next to consider of some way of raising of money to defray charges of repairing and enlarging their meeting-house either by selling some part of their common lands or by rate and also any other business that concerns said town.”

“April ye 3d anno 1706 at a town meeting in Duxborough, ye said town chose Mr. Seabury town treasurer, ye selectmen also appointed Mr. Seabury a viewer and gager of casks.

“At this town’s meeting ye said town agreed and voted to build a new meeting-house forty foot long and thirty-three foot wide and seventeen foot high in ye walls and that the said meeting-house shall be set up within three or four rods of the old meeting-house now in being ye said town also ordered that some part of their common lands should be sold to raise money to defray charges about building ye said meeting-house. These persons whose names are subscribed did protest against ye aforesaid order of selling ye town’s comon land for defraying ye charges about building ye said meeting-house.

Lieut. Francis Barker,
Robert Barker,
Josiah Barker,
Samuel Barker,
Jabesh Barker,
John Russel,
Francis Barker, Junr.”

The meeting was adjourned from the 3rd April 1706 to the next Wednesday at 12 of the clock. This is the record of that meeting:—

“April 10, 1706 at a town’s meeting in Duxborough the said town voted to chuse two agents and chose Cpt. Arnold and Mr. John Partridge to act for them ye said town on their account and at their charge in building their new meeting-house already voted

to be built, that is to say, to agree and bargain with a workman or workmen to build the said meeting-house and also to provide whatsoever is necessary for the said building.

"The town also voted that the comon lands lying on the south-westerly side of the old Bay Rhoad yt goes from the North river to Mile Brook that runs into Blackwater and so down to ye heads of the lots and also the town lands on the easterly side of ye said Bay Road lying between Mile brook running into Pudding brook and Philips brook should be sold to defray the charges of building the new meeting-house that is to say so much of ye said comon lands as is needful. Ye said town also voted to chuse three agents to act for them in selling the said comon lands and chose Cpt. Arnold, John Partridge and Thomas Loring."

"At a town's meeting in Duxborough Feb. 25, anno 170 6-7 Ye said town gave liberty to Benjamin Prior to remove his fence between ye meeting-house and his own house up to ye road and so for a time use that part of ye town comons provided that he keeps up ye bounds where his former fence stood, ye said town also chose Capt. Arnold and John Partridge their agents to sell ye old meeting-house but not to deliver it before ye new meeting-house is finished and excepting men's particular rights therein."

"At a town's meeting in Duxborough

upon the 16th of February anno dom. 1707-8 at this town meeting ye said town voted to give Mrs. Wiswall the ten pounds in money due to ye said town from Benjamin Prior in part for the old meeting-house in payment for part of a years salary due to Mr. Wiswall deceased which was never rated for."

From the foregoing records we gather:—

(1) That there was a church, an old church, one needing repairs and enlargement, standing next to Benjamin Prior's land.

(2) That a new church was built within three or four rods of the old one.

(3) That both churches were on the ground at the same time, as the old one was not to be delivered until the new one was ready for occupation.

(4) That the records speak of the church sold to Benjamin Prior, as for sale in February 1706-7, and of its sale in February 1707-8. The new meeting-house must have been built at this time and the following record proves this: "Reckoned with ye town agents Feb'y ye 25th anno 1707. Then received of said agents the sum of one hundred and eighty pounds in full for building ye meeting-house in Duxbury. I say received by me, Samuel Sprague." This building stood until June 7, 1785.

These records prove how correct was my conclusion, that two churches were located at the old cemetery on different sites at

some past time, and we see that there were two such churches within three or four rods of each other. So much being proved, disposes at once and forever of all suppositions of the first church, or any church before 1706, having stood elsewhere than at the cemetery between Hall's and Bayley's Corners.

It will be borne in mind that when Plymouth and Duxbury, through the committees appointed from both towns, tried to agree on some site, other than Plymouth, for the building of a church and town for greater strength and protection by the union of all, seven members of the joint committee voted to locate the church and town at Jones' river and two voted for Morton's Hole.

These committees were appointed by the Old Colony court on the 2nd of March, 1635-36, and on the 21st of March, 1635-36, the committees met and voted as above. Morton's Hole was so called from a large hole in the flats to the west of Captain's Hill, almost behind Mr. Ira Chandler's house. The vicinity around this was the site intended for the new town.

Morton's Hole Creek was there to supply them with water. Captain's Hill was there as a stronghold; and the people of Duxbury undoubtedly built their church there, perhaps having in view the possibility of a later union with Plymouth at this very place.

The upholders of the Harden Hill theory had not any facts, but they had the authority of Mr. Justin Winsor. Mr. Winsor's authority has been shaken, and his theory about Harden Hill falls to the ground.

It seems altogether certain to me from the record of this meeting about the possible removal of the Plymouth people to Kingston or Duxbury, and from the coming of Mr. Partridge in 1637, and from the Manuscript Records of the Plymouth Church, which state that the people of Duxbury, being "united into one body," called the Rev. Mr. Partridge as their minister, that there was no meeting-house built in Duxbury until 1637-1638. All the evidence proves this. It is certain that there was no new meeting-house built between 1638 and 1706. There is not even a hint of such in any of the records, while there are references to the repairs in the meeting-house. If a new meeting-house had been built between 1638 and 1706, there would, without question, be some report of the sale of lands to meet the expense, or of some means of raising money for the purpose. We must keep in mind that the first meeting-house in Plymouth was built in 1637.

It will be of interest to give copies of a few more records which have references to the meeting-house.

In the book of records marked A, page

191, there is a record on the 24th January, 1709, referring to a deed between John Robinson and Ichabod Wadsworth concerning land "on west side of the path which leads from the meeting-house over the south river to the four mile Hill."

From the known location of John Robinson's land and Ichabod Wadsworth's, it is plain that the meeting-house was located where we have proved it to have been. Of course this record of 1709 refers to the new meeting-house built in 1707, but as this was "within three or four rods" of the old meeting-house, the value of the record is just as great as evidence that Harden Hill could not have been the site of the first meeting-house, which all agree stood for about seventy years.

John Robinson was the minister called to succeed Mr. Wiswall. There is a record of July, 1701, stating that the town was considering the question of a convenient site for a parsonage for the new minister.

Another record that is of interest is the following, dated 30th June, 1714, and relating to the division of some lands between Benjamin Peterson and John Wadsworth. "We began at a stone pitched in the ground in the fence within four or five foot of the foot-path that goeth directly from the sd Jno. Wadworth's house to the meeting-house, viz., in y^e fence that is now the partition fence

between us the said Benjamin Peterson and John Wadsworth, and from said stone running North 34 degrees westerly upwards to a pine tree marked and then on the same line or course by a range of marked trees to a stake and stones by the highway that leads from Duxborough's meeting-house to Plymouth. Then we came back to the first mentioned stone pitched in the fence and run from thence downwards south thirty-six degrees easterly to another stone pitched in the ground on the brow of an hill and from thence on the same course through the swamp to a stake pitched in the salt marsh and from thence still the same course down into a creek called Morton's Hole in presence of us witnesses:

Christopher Wadsworth,
his c mark.

Mary Sampson
her λ mark.

Benjamin Peterson
his \mathcal{L} mark.

John Wadsworth."

This record is dated in 1714. The value of this as evidence is the reference to the meeting-house. It speaks of "the foot-path that goeth directly from John Wadsworth's house to the meeting-house." It is evident that the boundary laid out was one running north and then westerly until they reached the highway leading from Duxborough meet-

ing-house to Plymouth; then the boundary ran in a southerly direction, and then easterly by certain local marks of a stone, a swamp, and a stake in the salt marsh, and from thence still the same course, that is, easterly, down into Morton's Hole Creek.

I adduce this record not as necessary to prove the location of the meeting-house, but as confirmatory of what we have brought forward in relation to its location. This record would refer to the meeting-house built in 1707. As we have already seen, it was within three or four rods of the first meeting-house, and was ready for occupancy before the one sold to Benjamin Prior was delivered to him for removal.

On pages 97, 98, etc., in the Book A of the Duxbury Records, the following records are found:—

“We, the subscribers, selectmen of the town of Duxborough, have settled the bounds of several highways within said town as followeth, viz: Inprimis we began in the Captain's Nook at the fence, which is the partition between the farms of Miles Standish and Thomas Delano, Junr, near a red oak tree marked a little within the said Standish's land, thence running near north to two rocks about half a foot assunder near the range between Dea. Brewster and the said Delano, thence on a straight line to the southerly corner of the fresh meadow lot of

Benjamin Bartlett Junr, thence to the north-west corner of the said meadow lot, thence as the way now goes to the fence standing about fifteen feet to westward of the biggest barn on the farm of Samuel Bartlit, Decd., thence straight to a heap of stones on a rising spot, or knoll of land on the eastward side of the path that leads out of said nook, thence straight to a heap of stones nigh the corner of Israel Silvester's fence and the way now goeth up out of the nook opposite against a ditch or place gulled away by the rain down into Mrs. Wiswall's land, thence up to another stone pitched in the ground in sd Silvester's fence where he turns down to his house thence still upwards on a straight line to the south-westerly corner post of sd Silvester's leantoo adjoining to his barn, thence on a straight line to a stone in his fence, viz. still upward straight from the last mentioned stone still upward as sd Silvester's fence now goes till it comes to the land of Christopher Wadsworth, thence to a stone pitched in the ground which is the southeast corner between the land of Christopher Wadsworth and Benjamin Peterson, thence on a straight line to the upward corner of the land of Christopher Wadsworth, viz., that corner of his land which is a little to the southward of the meeting-house."

This highway was laid out 26 March, 1715, by Edward Southworth, John Simons,

and John Partridge, selectmen. Several other highways were laid out in different parts of the town by the same men, and all the highways are spoken of with reference to the meeting-house. The value of the above record, and of all these records, is to show that the meeting-house of 1715 could not have been at Harden Hill, nor could it have been at Mrs. Thomas Chandler's. We know where it was, but even had we not the very clear records we have as to its site, we could determine it from these records of the highways. But the church, the first church, taken down in 1707, and sold to Benjamin Prior, was within three or four rods of the one standing in 1715.

This is a list of some of those who bought land sold to defray the expenses of the new meeting-house built in 1707. It is a continuation of the record of the report of Seth Arnold, John Partridge and Thomas Loring, chosen agents of the town of Duxbury on 16th September, 1706, to sell lands to pay for "building a new meeting-house."

From Joseph Chandler in Tarkiln, fifteen pounds.

Abraham Booth, four acres.

Benjamin Kein, thirty acres, more or less.

Josiah Kein, nine acres, more or less.

John Bishop, fifteen and a half acres for six pounds and two shillings.

Samuel Bradford, Thomas Loring, Elisha

Wadsworth and Jonathan Brewster, fifty-five acres, more or less, for eleven pounds.

Aston Soule, twenty acres.

Mathew Kein, six acres.

Josiah Soule and Jonathan Brewster, one hundred and fifty acres.

George Williamson, three acres for twenty shillings.

James Boney and Isaac Pierce also bought land.

It will be noticed that in some cases the amount of money is given, in others the amount of land, and in others both money and land.

CHAPTER VI

It would seem that, perhaps, enough has been said to prove where the first meeting-house and the first cemetery were located. But to me it is important not only to prove my own contention, but also to disprove every other hypothesis advanced, and to meet all objections to my own. So we shall now consider the position of those who advanced the theory that the old meeting-house and cemetery lay on the point of land west of Morton's Hole, on, or near, what is now the farm of Mrs. Thomas Chandler, and that Myles Standish was buried there.

In order to reach this point or tongue of land stretching into the bay west of Morton's Hole, you should have highways from the different parts of the town leading to this place. But in all the records of the town from the earliest times there is not a hint of a highway into this tongue of land. In fact it would be absurd to suppose that Standish and the founders of the town would have built their meeting-house, in such an out-of-the-way place. Standish, Brewster, and those who lived in the Nook would have to come up to Hall's Corner and then pass westward in order to get around the marsh

that lay all round Morton's Hole, and then still westward of the Goodwin (now Saunders) house, and then southerly, to reach the meeting-house, and this in all kinds of weather. To imagine such a thing when the roads were bad, and when the bay came farther north than it does at present, when the whole valley lying around Morton's Hole was swamp, and marsh, and when quite a large creek flowed down through the gorge beside the first bridge on what is known as the New Road or Border Street—to imagine, I say, such a location for the meeting-house as on that tongue of land west of Morton's Hole, is to imagine that Standish, Brewster, Alden, and the other prudent men who settled the town were doing their best to make church-going as difficult as possible for themselves and for all concerned. Then all the people in the north end of the town, in fact, in all the town, (we have already spoken of the Nook), would have to trudge their weary ways over bad roads and private ways and around swamps to this southerly point of land in the town to reach their meeting-house. Would it not be more in accordance with reason to suppose that all the inhabitants of the town would vote to place the meeting-house in a central, accessible place? Why should they select the most inaccessible places and the most inconvenient?

It has been said that the swamp or marsh

around Morton's Hole did not in former times extend so far southwardly as at present; in other words, that the bay came in farther towards the north. Mr. Herbert Peterson, the present owner of the land in this marsh, says that he distinctly remembers when the marsh's edge was a good deal farther north than it is at present. This, too, is borne out by the fact that a fairly large creek called Morton's Hole creek ran into the bay at this point. The bed of the creek is still plainly visible, and the waters of the bay went up the creek to a considerable distance, just as at Eagle's Nest creek and Blue-fish river. That this was so is evidenced by the fact that in 1639 A.D., by order of the town a "wear" was to be set at Morton's Hole.

Taking all these things into consideration, and the swampy, boggy nature of the land around the Hole even to this day, we know that the arable and pasture land must have been less than it is today in this vicinity. These facts will be of the greatest interest when we keep them in memory in connection with the grants of land and the boundaries of farms and high-ways at and near Morton's Hole.

As has been said there was not a highway leading into this tongue of land, now owned by Mrs. Thomas Chandler, from any part of the town. Had Mr. Winsor adverted to what he wrote on page 183, he could have

saved a great deal of confusion, and if those who would locate the first meeting-house on Mrs. Chandler's farm would but attend to the geography of the town, and the records of highways, farms, and town's lands, they would be saved the mistake of trying to prove an impossible thing.

We have already seen that the Rev. Mr. Holmes built his house on land bought of John Sprague, and we have seen the location of that land with reference to Morton's Hole and the road leading from the meeting-house into the Nook. A road leading from Chandler's farm to the Nook could not by any possibility be the eastern boundary for a farm lying northeast of Morton's Hole marsh.

The Chandler farm is west of Morton's Hole, and no highway ever ran to and from Chandler's place. How could a farm lying northeast of Morton's Hole be bounded on its eastern side by a supposed road running from a point west of Morton's Hole to a point of land due east of Morton's Hole? It is well to bear in mind that Mr. Holmes came to Duxbury in 1658, and bought the land from Sprague and built his home thereon.

The location of the Sprague farm will also prove that the road from the meeting-house into the Nook could not be a road running from the Chandler farm. The Sprague homestead and farm lay between the Nook

and Powder Point. In the deed which will be cited later this will be more evident. We cite the following from the "Memorial of the Sprague Family" by Richard Soule. Speaking of Francis Sprague, who was admitted a freeman in 1637, Mr. Soule says: "Nothing is known in regard to the locality of his residence, except that it was somewhere on the shore between Captain's Hill and Bluefish River. In an interesting paper by the late Alden Bradford, entitled 'Notes on Duxbury', and published in the Massachusetts Historical Collections, it is stated as a matter of record, that a pathway was early laid out from Plymouth, over Jones' River, and crossing Island Creek, wound along near the shore of the bay to accommodate Standish, Brewster, Sprague, and others in the south and east part of the town, and then led over Blue river near the head of the salt water, and passing John Alden's settlement on the north side of this river was continued over Stony brook (Mill Brook) near Philip Delano, who had just begun a farm there by Duck Hill, to Careswell, the residence of Governor Winslow.

"Standish and Brewster, it is well known, resided on the south-eastern side of the peninsula, now called 'The Nook,' of which Captain's Hill forms a part. But whether Sprague, who is named with them in this extract, is to be classed with those who

dwelt in the south, or with those living in the east part of the town, does not clearly appear. It is most probable, however, that as the names of Standish and Brewster must have been intended to represent the first locality, that of Sprague, was introduced as representing the last."

This Francis Sprague was the father of John Sprague, who sold the land for his homestead to Rev. John Holmes. From this we can see that the Sprague land lay between the Nook and the Alden farm and the eastern shore. The Spragues never owned land on Harden Hill, nor where the Chandler farm is, west of Morton's Hole. The road from the meeting-house to the Nook must have run through the Sprague farm, and in fact we shall see that it did. The part of the Sprague farm sold to Holmes lay to the west of this road. The location, then, of the Sprague farm is of interest in this matter.

All that has been suggested so far is borne out by a reference to the highways set forth in Duxbury by the jury of twelve impaneled in 1637 for this purpose. Winsor in his History gives a good account of these highways on page seventeen. His description is taken from the original documents. He says: "The roads through Duxbury began at the ferry at Jones river, and thence by Stephen Tracy's (the present Samuel Loring's) to the bridge at John Rogers',

thence by Jonathan Brewster's cowyard, through a valley near the house of Mr. Prence, thence by Christopher Wadsworth's whose pallasadoe is to be removed, thence to Francis Sprague's and then fell into the way that leads from Morton's Hole to Ducksburrow Towne."

Continuing the description of the highways Winsor says: "From this main path (that is, the one just described) there branched off one going to the Nook to accommodate Standish and Brewster, and returning by Wm. Bassett's and Francis Sprague's, through an ancient path joined again the highway."

In these words we have again confirmation of the location of Sprague's land and therefore of the position of Wiswall's home in regard to the road leading from the meeting-house into the Nook. We may also refer to the fact that in 1638, when Prince was governor, the Plymouth Colony Records say: "Whereas there was a highway laid forth through Captain Standish and Mr. Brewster's ground on the Duxburrow side, which is not of use for the country, and they do therefore refuse to repair the same, the said Captain Standish and Mr. Brewster do undertake to repair said way and it to be only for their own use." This road leading into the Nook was repaired and improved in 1715, and to this we shall again refer in quoting some records concerning the location

of the Nook with regard to the meeting-house.

To return to a description of the highways as set forth by the jury of twelve in 1637: "From Wadsworth's the path led through Sprague's and Bassett's orchards, thence through John Washburn's land to William Palmer's gate, thence through Peter Brown's land to the westward of Henry Howland's house, thence through a marsh to Mr. John Alden's, thence through a valley by the corner of Philip Delano's farm to Edward Bumpasse's and thence by Rowland Leyborne's house to Green's Harbor."

Here again you will be helped to locate Sprague's land, and that of other early settlers.

CHAPTER VII

We know now the general run of the highways, and the locations of some of the farms and their situation as regards Morton's Hole.

The highways were: (1) the one from Plymouth through Kingston to Bayley's Corner, and then going through the woods towards the north-east, coming out at a point a little south of the Soldiers' monument near the Unitarian church, and bending around to the south-east by the eastern side of the old cemetery between Hall's and Bayley's Corners. The present direct road between these Corners was not made for many years after the settlement of the town. The Plymouth road, as already seen, came through Christopher Wadsworth's land into Sprague's, and from this place near Morton's Hole the second road was laid out.

(2) The second road ran from the north of Morton's Hole to the west of John Alden's farm of 169 acres to Mill Brook, to Duck Hill, and to the home of Winslow at Careswell. This is the road spoken of in the records as going from Morton's Hole to Ducksburrow town and having the church and cemetery on the west.

(3) The third road ran from the junction of the other two, north of Morton's

Hole to the homes of Standish and Brewster. A new road was made to the Nook in 1715, and this new road ran to the east of the old one made in 1637. These were the original roads of the town, and all other roads made in the town, as well as these, are found in the Old Colony Records, or in the records of Duxbury, and in the deeds about farms and public lands. It must be borne in mind that (1) the new road to Kingston, (2) the present road to the Nook from Hall's Corner, (3) the road from Hall's to Bayley's Corner, (4) the road from Hall's Corner to the South Duxbury station, and (5) the road from Hall's Corner coming to the eastern shore and along the shore to Powder Point, were not in existence for very many years after the settlement of the town; not one of these five roads was in being before the beginning of the eighteenth century.

The road to Standish's was, as we have seen, kept private for a number of years, and this is the path partly followed by the road made in 1715, A.D., when it was laid out as a highway through Wiswall's land up to the meeting-house.

From all this it will be evident that no highway led down to the farm of Mrs. Thomas Chandler. All the paths and roads converged to a point near the farms of Wadsworth and Sprague lying north of Morton's Hole. Mrs. Chandler's farm lies to the west of Morton's

Hole, and by no possibility could you conceive of a road leading from a supposed meeting-house on that farm into the Nook and bounding Wiswall's house lot of "five or eight acres" on the east.

When to all this you add that there is not the slightest trace of a meeting-house, or of a public graveyard, or of any public roads on Mrs. Chandler's farm, the most skeptical must be satisfied that the suggestion of some as to the location of the first church and graveyard on that farm is altogether gratuitous. In this case there is no claim advanced that the sea washed away the dead, nor is there any effort made to explain the absence of all trace of some scores of graves on that piece of land.

The old way from Mrs. Chandler's to the old road between Duxbury and Plymouth was a path leading up from this southerly point of land to the main road. This was the only way to and from that point of land, and Mrs. Thomas Chandler remembers when there was no other way. Now, the path leads up to the new road called Border Street. When you go down Border Street and pass the house of the late Mr. LeBaron Goodwin, you come to the lane that leads down to Mrs. Chandler's. There is a small piece of land on which there are four hills lying south of Border Street. On one of these hills on the south-east of this tongue of land is the

home of Mr. Ellis Peterson. Behind his house is another of these hills on the land of Mr. Goodwin (now Saunders). On the south-west corner of the land is the home of Mrs. Thomas Chandler, and it is on a hill, the third one, while the fourth hill lies on Mrs. Chandler's farm a few rods to the north of her house. These four hills, or hillocks, with the valleys, are all the land that lies on this tongue. The marsh and swamp came up to Goodwin's house on the east and northeast of this little promontory with its four hills, and on the north-west, west, and south, the bay and the swamp came in almost to the cart-road that leads to Mrs. Chandler's. The supposed meeting-house and graveyard lay to the north of Mrs. Chandler's dwelling house, or five or six rods north of her barn. The site is on the edge of the north-west hill on her farm, as it slopes to the west. This is a small piece of sloping land, and any person can at once see that it would be the height of folly for the first settlers of Duxbury to build their meeting-house and bury their dead there. There is not land enough for such a purpose. The site would be one of the most inconvenient in the town. It is simply a small piece of sandy soil with four small hills and their slopes. The people would have to trudge through dreary swamps to reach this spot. No highways ran to it;

not one of the farms mentioned in the records as lying near the meeting-house was there. None of the land lying south of the meeting-house could be there, for it is only a few rods to the water's edge on the south and west. What then of the farms mentioned as lying south of the meeting-house, north of Morton's Hole, and west of the road leading from the meeting-house into the Nook?

This place of four hills was evidently an Indian resort. Countless arrowheads, and Indian mortars for grinding corn, and heaps of clam-shells and of corn-stalks, have been ploughed up on these hills. Mrs. Chandler said the church and graveyard were on the little sand hill on Mr. Goodwin's farm. This would be an impossibility. No graves were ever found there, no church was ever built there. After digging down to quite a depth, we found nothing but some modern brick, and traces of burnt clam-shells, and some broken modern crockery. Afterwards we were told that Mrs. Chandler pointed out the wrong place, and that the supposed site of the old church and graveyard was on the western slope of the hill a few rods north of her dwelling house. Of this site we heard the full history from some of the oldest persons in town. From what has been said it will be seen that there is not a record, not a trace, of a meeting-house having ever been at or

near Mrs. Chandler's farm. The only evidence ever produced to prove that there was a meeting-house on this promontory of sand hills was the fact that some bones were found on the western slope of the hill north of Mrs. Chandler's house. A few bones were found. The conclusion deduced was this—here was the first graveyard, and therefore the first meeting-house, and therefore here Standish was buried. The wonder of it all is, that nobody can tell whether the bones were those of a white man or not, nor indeed if they were human bones at all. If the first burial ground were here, there should be at least about one hundred graves in the place, but there is no trace of such a thing.

Mr. Frank Ryder, who is acquainted with all the tradition about this old hill-side, says that it was a home, or private, or family, burial place. That it could not have been anything more, if even that, is too plain; and then to imagine that Captain Myles Standish would have buried his beloved children on the farm of a stranger, in a most forsaken and unseemly place, is the height of folly.

The search at Mrs. Thomas Chandler's was conducted by Dr. Wilfred G. Brown of Duxbury and myself.

Leaving Mrs. Chandler's we went to Mr. Frank Ryder's. Mr. Ryder lives in

a house known as the Cushman house. Our reason for going to Mr. Ryder's was this: Mrs. Ziba Hunt, who lives near the almshouse, and is a very old woman, told me that her mother, Mrs. Diana Chandler, had an old lady spinning for her, who had just come from Mrs. Cushman's, and this old lady told Mrs. Diana Chandler that Mrs. Cushman had pointed out to her the grave of Myles Standish from the window of Mrs. Cushman's house.

Dr. Brown and I went to Mr. Ryder's to find out if we could see the supposed graveyard at Mrs. Thomas Chandler's from "the Cushman house." We found that it would be a physical impossibility to see the reported graveyard from any part of Mr. Ryder's house. You could see the roof and part of Mrs. Thomas Chandler's house, but you could not see the ground at the back of her house, nor the lower slope on the western side of the hill which was the supposed graveyard. This is true even if all the trees intervening were removed. There are a few trees in the way, but the hill on which Mr. Ryder's house sits stretches so far to the south that it is impossible, owing to this hill and to other intervening hills, to see the land at the back of Mrs. Thomas Chandler's. The evident conclusion then is, that Mrs. Cushman could not have pointed out the supposed grave near Mrs. Thomas Chandler's, to the

old lady who did the spinning for herself and Mrs. Diana Chandler.

The house in which Mr. Ryder lives was partly built by Dr. John Wadsworth, who died in 1799. Since Dr. Wadsworth first built on that site, the house has been enlarged to three or four times its original size and extended several feet to the south. When built by Dr. Wadsworth, it was a small one-storey house.

Originally it faced the east, or east by north, while now the main part of the house faces the south. Even as the house now stands, extending much farther to the south, it would be impossible for any one to point out from it the grave, or to see any of the land around Mrs. Thomas Chandler's.

CHAPTER VIII

The "Ryder house," called by some the "Cushman house," was built in 1763 for Joshua Cushman, when he married Mercy Wadsworth, the daughter of Doctor John Wadsworth. This was the first house built in all that section of the town down to the bay.

Seeing that it would be impossible for any one to point out the supposed grave of Standish, near Mrs. Thomas Chandler's, from any part of the Ryder or Cushman house, and pursuing our investigations, we discovered several things of the greatest importance in this matter of the Cushman tradition.

First of all it was evident that the Cushman tradition, of whatever value, depended on the authority of Doctor John Wadsworth, the father of Mercy, who married Joshua Cushman in 1763. Dr. Wadsworth built a home for them. Now, Doctor Wadsworth's authority is plain. He spoke of two remarkable, triangular, pyramidal stones as marking the burial place of Standish. His daughter had her tradition from him, and thus the Cushman tradition in every form resolves itself into Dr. Wadsworth's statements.

Besides the story of the spinning woman,

who was a stranger in town, we have two other forms of the Cushman tradition. Let us examine the spinning woman's story first of all. Other traditions, doubtless derived from her story, make the same statement, that the grave of Myles Standish can be seen from the Cushman house. In testing this story we found that there were two Cushman houses and three Mrs. Cushmans. One Cushman house is the present Ryder house, and the other is the Charlemagne Cushman house, built about the year 1800 A.D., and now owned by Mrs. Captain Myrick. Mrs. Hunt, whose mother, Mrs. Diana Chandler, had heard the spinning woman's story, was unable to say which of the two Cushman houses was in question, and which of the three Mrs. Cushmans, Mrs. Joshua Cushman, or her daughter-in-law, Mrs. Ezra Cushman, or Mrs. Charlemagne Cushman. With all this doubt hanging around the exact house and the exact Mrs. Cushman, and whether one Mrs. Cushman might not have been visiting at the home of another Mrs. Cushman, or living there for the time, we could arrive at no satisfactory conclusion but this: that a Mrs. Cushman pointed out from a Cushman house the grave of Myles Standish to a spinning woman. This is the substantial evidence of the tradition.

Now, from neither Cushman house could

you see the reputed graveyard at Mrs. Thomas Chandler's. From Mrs. Myrick's, which is the Charlemagne Cushman house, you can see the old cemetery between Hall's and Bayley's Corners, and almost the very grave of Standish about the centre of the graveyard.

Another form of the Cushman tradition is that Dr. John Wadsworth, when taking his occasional visitors to see the burial place of Standish, always went to the south-east from his house. The conclusion would be that he went to the farm of Mrs. Thomas Chandler. This tradition is held by a very few people who can give no account of it, and who know nothing about where Doctor Wadsworth lived, nor the situation of his home with reference to either Mrs. Thomas Chandler's place, or the old cemetery between Hall's and Bayley's Corners. This tradition is evidently the same as that of which Mr. Stephen M. Allen gives an account in his letter to the Boston Transcript of June 2, 1891. Mr. Allen says:—

“The traditional account which was published in the Transcript some fifteen or eighteen years ago, herewith transcribed, seems much more plausible than the recent claims set up. It is as follows:—

‘The burial place of Standish has not yet been found. It was not until 1872 that we had any probable clew to its location. At

the laying of the corner-stone of the monument to Standish there was an old lady present, Mrs. Lorian Thomas Loring, now living at Charlestown, whose family formerly lived in Duxbury, who gave some light on that subject which may lead to the discovery of his grave. She said that her mother, Mary Cushman Thomas, who was a granddaughter of Dr. John Wadsworth, of Duxbury, who died in 1799, had many times informed her that when a girl of fifteen or sixteen she used to pass much time with her grandfather, who lived on or near the westerly shore of the head of the bay, directly west of Captain's hill and southwest of Morton's Hole, and on the west side of what is now the new road from Hall's Corner to Kingston, in a house still standing and occupied by Mr. George F. Ryder; that Dr. Wadsworth often had distinguished guests to dine with him, when she was present, and that after dinner in such cases it was almost his invariable custom to invite them to visit the grave of Standish near the shore; that she had many times seen her grandfather start from the south side of the house and go in a southeasterly direction to the shore with such guests to a small hill in two parts, now owned by Thomas Chandler, and lying almost down to the water's edge. In such cases on their return she had heard them converse about the grave and she had no doubt it was there. The

old lady died February 27, 1859, in Charlestown and but a year before her death, she reiterated her statement to Mrs. Loring. On examination we have found that at the time specified there was a road on the south side of Dr. Wadsworth's house which ran down toward the shore, but that it had long since been discontinued; also that upon one of the points on the rise of land, so mentioned, the first rude church of Duxbury is supposed to have been built. It is quite likely that the adjoining knoll should have been used for their first burying ground. It has been assigned as the reason for building the first church upon the shore, that it was for safety against any attack from the Indians, leaving a means of escape by boats across to Plymouth. The early records mention an examination near Morton's Hole for a church. Captain Standish, in his will said he desired to be buried beside his daughter and daughter-in-law. The daughter-in-law was the wife of Lieutenant Josiah Standish, who afterward married the daughter of Samuel Allen of Bridgewater. It is to be hoped that, although there is at present no sign of graves on the spot mentioned, if there they may yet be discovered, that the remains may be placed at the base of the Standish monument.' "

It is necessary to examine the story told by Mr. Allen.

First of all he speaks of "the traditional account," as if the obscure hint of a tradition to which he refers were the sum and substance of all reliable traditions on this matter. Then he says that it was only in 1872 that there was any probable clew to the location of the Standish grave. It was then Mr. Allen first heard what he calls a "probable" clew, but if he had inquired he would have found that many of the people knew of the burying place of Standish long before 1872.

Mr. Allen quotes Mrs. Loriann Thomas Loring as authority for his version of the traditional account. Mrs. Loring was the daughter of Mary Cushman Thomas, who was born in 1768 and was the daughter of Mercy Wadsworth (the daughter of Dr. John), who in 1763 married Joshua Cushman. The important points in Mrs. Loring's account are, that Dr. Wadsworth in going with his guests to the Standish burial place went to the southeast from his house, and that his house is the one now occupied by George Frank Ryder. Mr. Allen, in telling the public where George Frank Ryder's house is, says it is "on or near the westerly shore of the head of the bay, directly west of Captain's Hill and southwest of Morton's Hole, and on the west side of what is now the new road from Hall corner to Kingston." This story is entirely inaccurate. Mr. Ryder's house

lies north of the bay; it is far more north than west of Captain's Hill; it is almost due north of Morton's Hole, instead of being south-west as Mr. Allen's account says; and it is due north to the new road from Hall's Corner to Kingston.

Again, so far from Mr. Ryder's house having been the home of Dr. Wadsworth, the doctor built that house for his daughter in 1763; he lived on the Fernando Wadsworth homestead west of Bayley's Corner. George Frank Ryder, who lives in the old Cushman house, to which Mr. Allen refers, says that Dr. Wadsworth (the great-great-grandfather of Mrs. Ryder) lived on the Fernando Wadsworth homestead. Justin Winsor in his history of Duxbury, on page 12, writes: "On one of the roads leading from the inland towns, was situated the house of Dr. John Wadsworth, who was noted as rather an eccentric individual, and concerning whom some anecdotes of an amusing nature are still current. By his door frequently passed the adventuresome sons of farmers of the interior, eager to ship themselves on board some of the comparatively many fishing vessels, which were then often leaving Duxbury at the proper season. At one time a party of these going by, asked the doctor the distance to the village, and other questions concerning the prospects before them, who met them with the reply: 'Ah, you are going there, are you? That

place is Sodom. I tell you it is going to be sunk, it is! Well, now, do you want me to make you a rhyme? Well, then—

The Swampineers avoid all fears,

A fishing they will go,

If they scape h—, it will be well,

But that they willn't I know.'

And with this most solemn warning he dismissed them."

From this it will be seen that as Dr. Wadsworth lived on one of the roads leading from the inland towns he could not have lived in the Ryder house. No public highway ever ran by the Ryder house, and the Ryder house is not even now on a highway, nor is it situated on the way from the inland towns to the shore. Those who know best say that Dr. Wadsworth lived beyond Bayley's Corner, on the Fernando Wadsworth place.

Dr. Wadsworth was born in 1706, and died in 1799. The only ways open to him to reach the old cemetery between Hall's and Bayley's Corners, were either to go to the northeast and turning to the east by the old road before mentioned, (which was a little south of the Soldiers' monument) bend round to the southeast and so come to the old cemetery; or he could go to the southeast from his house by a path that led to the home of his daughter Mercy, Mrs. Joshua Cushman, and turning towards the east bend a little

towards the northeast to the old cemetery. This latter was the shorter route on foot, and the more picturesque, lying within view of the bay, and Dr. Wadsworth would be traveling almost all the time through land belonging to himself or his family. In this way he would have gone in a southeasterly direction from his own house. But Mr. Allen says that the doctor went in a southeasterly direction from Mr. Ryder's house to the Chandler place. Now this is an absolute impossibility. The home of Mrs. Thomas Chandler lies in a south-westerly direction from the Ryder home, and the roadway or rather path of which Mr. Allen says he found traces ran in a south-westerly direction. This is the path which Mrs. Thomas Chandler says was for the convenience of private persons, not of the public.

In Mrs. Lorian Thomas Loring's account we see that she does not say that her mother ever said that she went with Dr. Wadsworth and his guests to the burial place of Standish. Mrs. Loring's mother, Mrs. Cushman Thomas (daughter of Mercy Wadsworth) left Duxbury when a young woman, and, from the account we receive from her, it is plain that she did not live in the same house with her grandfather, Dr. John Wadsworth. She lived in her father's house, the Joshua Cushman house, where George Frank Ryder now lives. The whole

story is so full of inaccuracies about places, dates, and directions, that its value amounts simply to this, that Dr. John Wadsworth was in the habit of taking his guests to see the burial place of Myles Standish, and that this burial place was in the south-eastern part of Duxbury, near the bay and within easy walking distance of Dr. Wadsworth's home. Also we see that his burial place was beside the church. Hereafter we shall see that Dr. Wadsworth spoke of the two remarkable triangular pyramids of stone that marked the burial place. It is not necessary to dwell at greater length on this version of the Cushman tradition, except to say that its whole value depends on the authority of Dr. Wadsworth, and his more explicit testimony we shall see later.

We must not omit to refer to Mr. Allen's last argument to uphold the groundless theory he advocates. He says: "It has been assigned as the reason for building the first church upon the shore, that it was for safety against any attack from the Indians, leaving a means of escape by boats across to Plymouth." This is, perhaps, the strongest argument for this theory. According to this, the Indians were to attack the town when the people, men, women, and children, were at the little meeting-house, or the people were all to rush there when attacked, all the boats were to be there, and the waters of

Kingston Bay and of Plymouth Bay were to remain in the bays all the time!

A third version of the Cushman tradition is that Myles Standish was buried a few rods to the south-east of Mr. Ryder's house, on the farm now owned by Mr. Ryder. This shows that the belief of later generations of Cushmans in the Thomas Chandler farm theory was not very strong. Mr. Ryder points out the spot on his farm, which one of Mrs. Ryder's ancestors believed to be the burial place of Standish, and which Mr. Cushman did not allow to be ploughed for a number of years. It is not necessary to say that the Mr. Cushman who held this absurd theory had no grounds for holding it. The Ryder farm and all the land south to the shore, including Mrs. Myrick's, Ellis Peterson's, Mrs. Thomas Chandler's, George Torrey's, Henry Barstow's, Fernando Wadsworth's, etc., etc., all belonged to the farm of Christopher Wadsworth almost from the time he came to Duxbury with the first settlers. He bought Job Cole's land and John Starr's and other land, which, with the grants to himself, made an immense farm. There never was any town land on any part of this farm, whether at Mrs. Thomas Chandler's place or elsewhere. The Captain would not be buried on another man's farm, nor would he bury his children there. Christopher Wadsworth was alive in 1677.

In closing this Chandler farm theory, it is not needless to say that the first house built in that particular section of South Duxbury about the Chandler farm was built in 1763 by Dr. John Wadsworth. It is the house known as the George Frank Ryder house.

Mrs. Thomas Chandler herself told me that the bones found on or near her farm were Indian bones. She said that her husband had found quantities of arrow-heads, pieces of broken mortars, and heaps of clam-shells and burnt corn-stalks, on this little bit of sandy ground so unceremoniously thrust on public notice as the first cemetery and site of the first meeting-house. Several of the oldest people in the community told me that the general impression was that the few bones found in this place were Indian bones. Mr. George Frank Ryder thought they were the remains of a private burial place.

In the heyday of Duxbury when ship-building was quite an industry, there was a ship-yard on this point of land. A private pathway or road led up from it to the old Bay Road, passing near where Mr. Ryder's house stands. Mrs. Thomas Chandler told me that she very clearly remembered this road as existing fifty years before my interview with her, and that it was always a private road.

CHAPTER IX

There has always been a tradition in the town that the Standish burial place was marked by two peculiar stones lying due east and west about six feet apart. Mr Justin Winsor in his History of Duxbury, speaks of this tradition. He says: "There are, a short distance easterly from the site, (to what site Mr. Winsor refers it is not easy to see;) two stones of considerable size, which are about six feet apart, and were thought to mark, perchance, the grave of some one of the family. A few years ago investigations were made, but without affording any foundation for the supposition." In a foot-note Mr. Winsor says: "Their peculiar shape (that is the peculiar shape of the two stones), though evidently in their rough state, and the fact that their position to each other was exactly east and west, induced some persons to dig between them in hopes of making a discovery. Excavations were accordingly made to the depth of eight feet, without, however, any success. In a biographical sketch of the author, appended to Capt. Samuel Delano's Voyages, and written in 1817, it is stated in speaking of Capt. Standish, 'Here he died; and some aged

people in the close of the last century pointed out the spot where he was buried.'” Mr. Winsor then tells of an antiquarian friend who commenced his researches in Duxbury about 1827, and who was unable to verify oral tradition, nor could he find any trace of such a tradition among the octogenarians of that time.

From these facts we gather that a few years before 1849 (when Mr. Winsor published his history) a search was made in a spot pointed out by two stones under the impression that Standish, or some of his family, might have been buried there. Mr. Winsor’s antiquarian friend, the Rev. Mr. Kent, who began his researches in 1827, or thereabouts, must have been misinformed, or else he did not come in contact with the right people. That the tradition has always been in the town is too evident.

The facts cited by Mr. Winsor attest the existence of the tradition. That his friend was unable to meet anyone to tell him of the tradition, is of no consequence in the face of the contrary facts, and the value of this friend’s negative testimony would largely depend on the manner in which he investigated. From the evidence produced, from the records about the old meeting-house, it is clear that antiquarians in Duxbury have been rather vague in their searches and very easily satisfied with proofs.

The venerable antiquarian of 1827, referred to by Mr. Winsor, and quoted with sublime faith by Mrs. Jane G. Austin, was the Rev. Mr. Kent. He was a devoted collector of Standish relics from the cellar of the Captain's house, and the young boys of the time very often scattered "Standish relics" in that place for his benefit. Some of those boys, now old men, have often told me with a chuckle how they loved to play pranks on the venerable and guileless antiquarian, and how they enjoyed his delight in going over the same ground again and again and always with most remarkable success in finding modern Standish relics. We all know of such innocent collectors of relics, and books, and paintings. But Mr. Kent evidently never searched the records of Duxbury and Plymouth, never studied the locations of roads, the boundaries of farms, or anything else that would throw light on the location of the meeting-house and cemetery of the early settlers. When his testimony is quoted—one hesitates.

I have referred to Mr. Winsor's History of Duxbury where he says, "There are, a short distance easterly from the site, two stones of considerable size, which are about six feet apart, and were thought to mark, perchance, the grave of some one of the family." Mr. Winsor continues, that investigations having been made by digging

between the stones, there was not found anything to afford foundation for the supposition that anyone had been buried there. I have said that you cannot tell to what "site" Mr. Winsor is referring. Mrs. Jane G. Austin, a writer of Old Colony stories, in some letters to the Boston Transcript and other papers, suggests that the two stones spoken of by Mr. Winsor were "near his own house," that is, Standish's own house. Of course, no trace of a body was found there, for evidently no body was ever buried there. The stones may have been gateway stones, or markers for a path or way, either into Standish's place or to Elder Brewster's place, or they may have been placed there long after Standish's time.

Mrs. Austin in her letters says the three-cornered stone theory took its rise in 1887. Of course this is not so, for many of the old people of the town had the tradition handed down to them about the remarkable three-cornered stones at Standish's burial place. Among some of the many of the oldest people who told me about the tradition they had known from their earliest years were Mr. Benjamin Prior,* Miss Caroline B. Hall, Mr. Ziba Hunt, Mrs. Ziba Hunt, Mr. Ezra Cushman, not to mention Miss Lucia A. Bradford, a direct descendant of Governor Bradford, a woman of the best education and culture, and one of the most

*Not Mrs. Hall's friend.

highly respected women in New England in her time. Miss Bradford was over eighty years of age at the time she told me of the tradition; she was greatly interested in our researches, and notwithstanding her age, was as bright and intellectual a person as one would rarely meet in life. Miss Bradford showed me a letter which she had received from Mrs. Jane G. Austin, who asked Miss Bradford if she did not think that Standish was buried at Harden Hill. Miss Bradford wrote in reply an emphatic letter declaring that Standish was buried in the little cemetery between Hall's Corner and Bayley's Corner. Indeed Miss Bradford was very emphatic in her statements, that all that she ever had heard from her parents and others showed that Standish was buried where we later found his grave. As to the widow of Captain Standish, the last mention of her found in the records is on the 6th October, 1659, when the inventory of the estate of Elizabeth Hopkins of Plymouth is mentioned. This is the Elizabeth Hopkins in whose behalf Standish was to have been prosecutor in Plymouth Court two days after his death. All further information I have been able to collect about Mrs. Standish says that she went to Connecticut and lived with her son Josias and died there.

I have spoken of Miss Caroline B. Hall. Miss Hall was quite an elderly lady, living at Hall's Corner in the large old Hall

homestead. Miss Hall was a descendant of Captain Standish through her mother, Mrs. Ruth Josselyn Hall. Mrs. Austin visited Miss Hall in Duxbury after Mr. Melzar Brewster had found the three-cornered stones in the little cemetery, where they may be seen; at the time Miss Hall had two other visitors with her, and Miss Hall told me that Mrs. Austin was very enthusiastic about the two stones in the little cemetery near Hall's Corner, and proposed and promised to bury Captain Standish in what we call the Hall's Corner cemetery, and to mention the two stones, in her next novel. At the time of this visit to Miss Hall, Mrs. Austin was living in Plymouth, where she used to make her summer home. Mrs. Austin in one of her letters thus refers to the matter; she says that in 1887, when "she heard a rumor that a lady in Duxbury possessed a document proving the burial place of Myles Standish," she called upon her, etc. Mrs. Austin does not refer to the several historic relics of Duxbury and Standish loaned to her by Miss Hall, to assist her in getting local color for her novels. There were two other visitors, as I have said, present during the call of Mrs. Austin. Miss Hall was, when I knew her, a very bright woman for all her seventy-six years. She was somewhat disappointed in Mrs. Austin's treatment of the history of Duxbury, and wrote

asking for the return of the cherished relics she had allowed Mrs. Austin to borrow. Miss Hall considered Mrs. Austin's history very inaccurate.

Miss Hall owned a large scrap-book, bound with russet leather and filled with newspaper clippings. Towards the end of the book is pasted a bit of writing paper, on which is written in the hand-writing of Miss Hall's mother, Mrs. Ruth Josselyn Hall:—

"Miles Standish, 1660, the first, was buried in the old grave yard. Two three corner stones to his grave."

When Miss Hall showed me this record I was greatly interested. I took a copy of it, with her permission. Miss Hall's mother was born in 1779 and died in 1873; she was ninety-four years of age at her death.

To the above record Miss Hall had added this note: "As told by Benjamin Prior, who was born in 1775." Miss Hall said her mother wrote this record about 1858.

The story of this record is this. The Benjamin Prior referred to died in 1867. He was ninety-two years of age at his death. In a conversation with Mrs. Ruth Josselyn Hall, he told her about the two stones, and Miss Hall told me that he was referring to the old graveyard between Hall's and Bayley's Corners. That Mrs. Hall made a mistake about the date of Standish's death is

not important. She speaks of him as "Miles" "the first."

It will be observed, then, that the tradition about the three-cornered stones was in Duxbury before 1887, when Mrs. Jane G. Austin says it arose.

As the document in Miss Hall's possession was of some value, and as something might happen to destroy it, Mr. Stillman B. Pratt, the publisher of the Duxbury Pilgrim, and I on a visit at Miss Hall's house, asked her permission to have two attested copies taken of the record. To our request she gladly consented. We called in Mr. George H. Stearns, the Postmaster of Duxbury, who was also a Justice of the Peace, and we secured two attested copies of the following:—

"DUXBURY, MASS., April 14, 1892.

To Whom it may concern:—

This is to certify that among the private and choice papers of my mother, Ruth (Josselyn) Hall, the following record in her own handwriting, came into my possession at her death on March 1, 1873:

Copy of Record

'Miles Standish, 1660, the first, was buried in the old grave yard. Two three corner stones to his grave.'

(Signed by Miss Hall.)

Plymouth ss. Duxbury, Mass., April 14, 1892.

102 THE GRAVES OF MYLES STANDISH

Personally appeared the above named Miss Hall and made oath of the truth of the above statement.

GEORGE H. STEARNS,
Justice of the Peace.

Witnesses:

STILLMAN B. PRATT, publisher of Duxbury Pilgrim.

E. J. V. HUIGINN."

Miss Hall, as said, had added to her mother's record the words, "As told by Benjamin Prior, who was born in 1775."

Mr. Pratt took one of the copies of the above attested record, and I have the other in my possession. Miss Hall promised me the scrap-book for the town of Duxbury, and after her death it was placed with other articles she gave in the Duxbury Library.

We now come to Mrs. Hall's version of the Doctor Wadsworth testimony. I consider Mrs. Hall's testimony of greater value than Mrs. Loring's about the same evidence, for Mrs. Hall was more deeply interested, and always lived in Duxbury near the cemetery.

Mrs. Ruth Standish Hall, whose maiden name was Ruth Standish Josselyn, died in 1873 at the advanced age of 94 years. Mrs. Hall lived at Hall's Corner, being the wife of Captain Daniel Hall, and the mother of Miss Caroline B. Hall, who now lives in the Hall homestead at Hall's Corner,

Duxbury. Mrs. Hall was the daughter of Olive Standish (husband's name Josselyn), who was the daughter of David Standish, who was the son of Thomas Standish, who was the son of Alexander, the eldest surviving son of the Captain. Mrs. Hall was a woman of remarkable brightness of mind until the time of her death, and her memory was unailing. Mrs. Hall often told her daughter, Miss Caroline B. Hall, and others that the burial place of Standish was marked with two triangular pyramidal stones. When she was a young girl she was visiting at the house of Doctor John Wadsworth (who was born in 1706 and died in 1799), and she heard him invite two gentlemen who were visiting him to go with him and see the grave of Myles Standish. After the gentlemen and the Doctor had returned to the Doctor's home, Mrs. Hall, at that time unmarried, heard the Doctor and his guests speak of the strange stones that marked the burial place, and heard the Doctor express his surprise that two such stones, triangular pyramids, could have been found for that purpose. This tradition Mrs. Hall frequently mentioned.

It is to be observed that Miss Josselyn (later Mrs. Hall) did not accompany the Doctor and his guests. Her testimony is to the fact that the Doctor and his guests identified the burial place of Standish with two triangular pyramidal stones.

Let us now examine the value of this tradition. If it were false, a proof could easily be supplied by digging in the place pointed out. If it were true, the graves would agree in their testimony with the testimony of the Captain's will. Dr. Wadsworth could have had no inducement to tell a lie about the matter.

But what positive value has Doctor John Wadsworth's testimony? His testimony is of value in proportion to his opportunities of knowing the truth, and his power of remembering it and handing it down.

That Doctor John Wadsworth was a capable and trustworthy witness, all admit. He was considered one of the leading men of the town in his time. His history shows a man of great power and originality. He was born in 1706 and died in 1799. He was the great-grandson of Christopher Wadsworth, who was one of the most important of the first settlers. This Christopher was over and over again one of the chief officers of the town. His land included all the land now occupied by Ellis Peterson, Mrs. Thomas Chandler, Mrs. Myrick, George Frank Ryder, George Torrey, Fernando Wadsworth, and all the land of the farms lying inside these farms as well as much that lay outside these bounds. Christopher Wadsworth was alive in 1677, as his will then made

testifies. He lived twenty-one years after the death of Standish. He undoubtedly knew where Standish was buried.

Christopher Wadsworth's wife, Grace, was alive in 1687.

Christopher Wadsworth's eldest son, Joseph, was alive in 1689.

All these three would have known of the burial place of the Standishes, and have told their children about it.

Christopher's son, Deacon John Wadsworth, was born in 1638 and died in 1700. This John was 18 years of age when Standish was buried. Of his own knowledge, and from his father, mother, and others of the older people, he would most certainly have known the burial place of Standish. The wife of this Deacon John was Abigail Andrews, who died in 1723. This Deacon John was the grandfather of Dr. John Wadsworth. So far then the Wadsworths had every opportunity of knowing all about the last resting place of Captain Standish.

The father of Doctor John Wadsworth, was Deacon John Wadsworth the second, the son of the first Deacon John.

This John the second married Mercy Wiswall, the daughter of Rev. Ichabod Wiswall, who had been minister to the town from 1676 to 1700. Deacon John the second died in 1750. He would have had the tradition in a direct line from his grandmother,

his grandfather, his father, and other living witnesses of the Captain's funeral. When this second Deacon Wadsworth died, his son, Dr. John, was 44 years of age, and was capable of receiving the tradition, and of handing it down. When Doctor John's grandmother died, the Doctor was 17 years of age. We might add the evidence of Elisha Wadsworth, who was alive after 1714 and whose wife died 1741. This Elisha was the son of Joseph, the eldest son of Christopher, the founder of the family in Duxbury. We might also add the testimony of Captain Wait Wadsworth, the son of Elisha, who was alive as late as 1768.

So much for Wadsworth evidence. But Doctor John could have learned of the burial place of the Captain from many others.

Mrs. Alexander Standish, the wife of Standish's eldest son, was alive 1723. She would have known from her husband, who died in 1702, where the Captain was buried. And so of others. But the wife of Doctor John was Mary Alden, who was the daughter of Benjamin, the son of David, the son of John Alden. Now John Alden died in 1687, thirty-one years after the death of Standish. Alden would have known where Standish was buried. His son, David, was thirty years of age when Standish died. He, too, would have known where the Captain was buried.

Mary Alden would thus have known through her grandfather, great-grandfather, and others, relatives and friends, where Standish and his daughters were buried. Thus Doctor Wadsworth would have the very best evidence on his own side and on his wife's as to the burial place of Myles Standish. David Alden here mentioned was born in 1626 and was alive in 1679; his brother, Jonathan Alden, was born in 1627 and died in 1697, and Abigail, the wife of Jonathan, died in 1725. Here are many other links connecting the generation of Dr. Wadsworth with the generation alive in the time of Standish. The links could be multiplied many times over.

From this it will be seen that Doctor Wadsworth had the very best opportunities for knowing about Standish's burial place, and from all we can learn the Doctor was a very reliable witness. His evidence was that Standish was buried in the south-eastern part of the town, in a well-known graveyard, and that two triangular pyramids of stone marked the burial place. This evidence of the stones can be found only in the graveyard between Hall's and Bayley's Corners. All the traditions are verified there. The graves themselves speak in evidence. When Doctor Wadsworth died, Mrs. Ruth Hall was twenty years of age. Mrs. Hall, being a direct descendant of Standish, would take a deeper interest in all traditions about him than

most people, and she handed down to her daughter and others the testimony she had received from Dr. John Wadsworth.

Miss Caroline B. Hall, above mentioned, died in April, 1892; the writer attended her funeral.

CHAPTER X

The second line of testimony transmitted through Mrs. Hall is that coming from the Prior family. The Priors lived around the first church. One of them, Benjamin Prior, bought the old church when it was sold in 1707. The Prior family always lived in that part of the town around the old graveyard between Hall's and Bayley's Corners. The Prior tradition is, that Myles Standish was buried in the old graveyard just mentioned, and that his burial place was marked by two triangular, pyramidal stones. The Priors would have known the Standishes, and the Wadsworths, and the Aldens, and the Brewsters, and all the other families. They all attended the same church, and the same town meetings in the church, and they would have frequently talked of the Captain and his burial place. There were then no newspapers, no great number of books, to distract attention, and the families gathered around the log fires in the evenings would have talked over the first settlers and their lives and deaths. Thus the knowledge of Standish's grave would be general. Thus in every sense the evidence would be tested.

The Prior tradition is clear and strong.

Benjamin Prior, the last of the family who inherited the family place, was born in 1775 and died in 1867. He told Mrs. Ruth Hall that Standish was buried between Hall's and Bayley's Corners, in the old cemetery, and that two triangular, pyramidal stones marked the place. Mrs. Hall wrote this testimony in her scrap-book where it is yet to be seen. Mr. Prior told Mrs. Hall that the Prior family always held the above tradition, which came down from his great-grandfather, who was a boy of ten years of age when Standish died, and who handed down the tradition concerning the grave with the added circumstance that he, only a boy of ten years of age, remembered the funeral, which took place in the graveyard near his father's home. This evidence coming from young Prior (who, as he grew older, would have most abundant opportunities for having the independent testimony of the Standishes, the Aldens, the Wadsworths, the Brewsters, the Spragues, etc., etc.) is of great value. The location of his father's home was such as to give the boy an opportunity of seeing the funeral, and week by week as he went to service, or as he went to the town meetings in later life, he would have been reminded of the funeral he had seen when a boy. It must be borne in mind that we are not dependent on the evidence, of the boy, Prior, simply as a boy, in this

matter. His evidence, confirmed by his elders and handed down afterwards to his son, then to his grandson, and finally to his great-grandson, comes to us with every mark of weight and authority. The Benjamin Prior, who told the family tradition to Mrs. Hall, was born in 1775 and died in 1867. His father was born in 1740, his grandfather in 1699, and his great-grandfather in 1646. Each of these was named Benjamin. There could have been no inducement for any of the Priors to tell a lie about the burial place of Standish. The lie could be easily detected by opening the graves. The graves were opened, and, as we shall see, everything proved the truth of the tradition here given.

Another tradition is that of the Brewster family. The Brewsters lived near Standish, and they would have known of the Captain's burial place. Mr. Melzar Brewster (a direct descendant of the Elder), who lives to the east of the old cemetery near Hall's Corner, told the tradition of the family, received from his father and grandfather, that Standish was buried in the old cemetery between Hall's and Bayley's Corners. This, Mr. Melzar Brewster said, was the constant tradition in the Brewster family; and besides he said that all the old people of the town, whom he remembered, always said that this old cemetery was the only cemetery in the early town, and the oldest one in town. He also

testified to the tradition about the two triangular stones.

The tradition in the Faunce family is the same. The Faunces bought the farm of Myles Standish within three years after the great-grandson of Myles had sold it. For one hundred years at least the Faunces held this farm. Their tradition is, that the first church and churchyard were where the old cemetery now is, near Hall's Corner, that Myles Standish was buried there, that there never was a church or churchyard in any other part of the town until 1783 or 1784, and that the day on which Standish was buried was the stormiest day the new town had felt from its foundation. This last circumstance would fix the minds of the people on the funeral of the Captain.

The traditions are all clear and well defined, having been cherished in the families that lived near Standish and around the graveyard. It is impossible to find a tradition of any antiquity or value assigning any other place as the burial place of Standish.

The traditions about the Standish burial place exclude the notion that Standish was buried elsewhere than in the cemetery between Hall's and Bayley's Corners.

From several of the older people in town I frequently heard the statement that the day of the Captain's funeral was the stormiest day the Pilgrims had known in New England.

CHAPTER XI

Besides those already mentioned as having been alive at the time of the funeral of Standish and as being most likely to know all about it, we may also mention the following persons who lived in the town at the time. These persons would have known where Standish was buried, and would have served as witnesses to transmit the tradition.

Robert Barker, who was admitted a free-man of Duxbury in 1654, and died between 1689 and 1692, the dates of his will and of the inventory of his estate.

Benjamin Bartlett, who was admitted in 1654, and married Sarah Brewster; he died in 1691.

William Bassett, who died in 1669, and had land near the Nook, beside Sprague's land.

Thomas Boney, the town shoemaker, admitted in 1640 and died about 1693. Shoemakers heard all town news.

Major William Bradford born in 1624 and died in 1703.

Deacon William Brewster, (son of Love Brewster), who died in 1723, being seventy-eight years of age.

Wrestling Brewster, son of Love Brewster, died in 1697. Love Brewster, the father

of Deacon William and of Wrestling, married in 1634, and he had Nathaniel, William, Wrestling, and Sarah. Sarah married Benjamin Bartlett in 1656, the year Standish died.

There were several members of the Chandler family alive when Standish was buried and for many years afterwards.

Thomas Clark, who arrived in 1623 and died in 1697, at the age of 97 years.

Mr. William Collier died about 1671.

Philip Delano admitted in 1632, died about 1681. His son, Philip, was born about 1635, and lived to be over eighty years of age; his son, Thomas, was born about 1636 or 1637, and was alive in 1699, when he married his second wife, his first wife having been a daughter of John Alden. John, the son of the first Philip, was born about or before 1640, and was alive in 1690. Samuel, another son, born a little after 1640, married Elizabeth, daughter of Alexander Standish, and was alive in 1686 and later.

William Ford, who lived in Duxbury as early as 1643 and died 1676, aged 82 years.

Josiah Holmes married Hannah, daughter of Henry Sampson, and he was alive in 1679.

John Howland died in 1672, aged eighty years. His wife, Elizabeth Tillie died 1687, aged eighty-one years.

Henry Howland, of Duxbury in 1633, died in 1670. He was one of the substantial freemen of the town.

John Pabodie, of Duxbury in 1637, died about 1666. His son William was born in 1620; he was "a man much employed in public affairs and of much respectability."

William married Elizabeth Alden in 1644 and died in 1707 aged 87 years. She died in 1717 in Little Compton, aged 93 years. William Pabodie lived near Standish and Brewster, and had thirteen children, eleven being daughters. One daughter, Priscilla, married Rev. Mr. Wiswall; she died in 1720.

George Partridge was a yeoman in 1636. He married Sarah Tracy in 1638, and died about 1695. His daughter, Lydia, married Deacon William Brewster and died in 1743. His daughter, Triephosa, married Samuel West. Samuel died in 1689; Triephosa died in 1701. Another daughter married Rhodolphus Thacher.

John Rogers, of Duxbury in 1634, was alive in 1660, the date of his will. His son, John, died about 1696; this son had married Elizabeth Pabodie in 1666; she was born in 1647.

Henry Sampson, who came to Duxbury with Standish and lived near him, and whose son Caleb married Mercy, daughter of Alexander Standish, died in 1684. Henry's son, Stephen, lived in Duxbury and died in 1714.

Abraham Sampson, a freeman in 1654, was alive in 1686. He lived in Duxbury from 1638. His son, Abraham, married Sarah,

daughter of Alexander Standish, and this son was alive long after 1690. Isaac Sampson, son of the first Abraham, married another daughter of Alexander Standish; he died in 1726.

Members of the Seabury, Simmons, and Soule families were also in town at Standish's death, and lived many years after that event.

Constant Southworth, born 1615, married Elizabeth Collier in 1637; died in 1679. He was in town when Standish died.

Francis Sprague, admitted in 1637, was alive in 1666. His son, John, who married Ruth Bassett, was killed in 1676.

Alexander Standish, the eldest surviving son of Myles, died in 1702, and his second wife in 1723.

Captain Josias Standish, son of Myles, lived in Duxbury. After a time he went to Bridgewater, but returned to Duxbury in 1663. Finally he left Duxbury in 1686 and went to Norwich, Conn.

Myles Standish, son of Alexander, lived in Duxbury and died in 1739. His wife, Experience, died in 1743 or 1744.

Ebenezer, a son of Alexander Standish, died in 1734, being 62 years of age.

Myles Standish, the son of Myles, the son of Alexander, the son of the Captain, was born in 1714, inherited the homestead, and in 1763 sold it to Samuel and Sylvanus

Drew, who sold to Wait Wadsworth, who sold it to John Faunce.

Rhodolphus Thacher, who married Ruth Partridge, was alive in 1686.

From all these names, and many others might be added, it will be seen that very many witnesses would have been able to hand down the tradition of the funeral and burial place of Standish. Undoubtedly these people often spoke of the brave Captain and told all of his life and death they knew. The chain of evidence could not be stronger. It is well to observe the dates and the inter-marriages in the above list.

CHAPTER XII

We now come to the graves. For a great many years the old cemetery was neglected. There were no fences around it and roaming cattle strayed over it. An end was put to this worse than indifference by the Rural Society of Duxbury. The Society sent a man to repair the fences and to clean up the graveyard. Mr. Melzar Brewster did this, and did it well. When at work Mr. Brewster found two stones marking the burial place of Lora Standish; they were covered with sand. Mr. Brewster raised them to the surface in the exact places where he found them.

The Duxbury Rural Society at last determined to test the tradition about the three-cornered stones, and obtained permission from the selectmen of Duxbury to open the grave marked by the two pyramidal stones. Mr. Frederick B. Knapp of the Powder Point School was the President of the Rural Society and had charge of the investigating party. One day in April, 1889, Monday the 15th, I think, the following were present at the opening of two of the graves: Mr. Frederick B. Knapp, Mrs. Frederick B. Knapp, Miss Lucia A. Bradford, Miss Caroline B. Hall, all of Duxbury; Miss



THE GRAVES AS THEY WERE WHEN WE INVESTIGATED

Knapp of Plymouth, Miss Ford of Duxbury, Mr. C. N. B. Wheeler and Mr. Rounseville of Powder Point School, Mr. Sidney Lawrence of Pittsburg, Pa., Mr. Charles M. Gaines of Duxbury, Professor A. B. Hart of Harvard College, Mr. C. M. Doten of the well known paper, the Old Colony Memorial of Plymouth, and Doctor Jones of Kingston, Mass.

The first grave opened was that between the two stones, where the skeleton of a young woman was found. Next adjoining it, on the north side, another opening was made and the skeleton of a man was found. The party then discontinued the work. Some thought that the man's skeleton was that of Standish and others thought it was not; nothing definite came of the effort, except to prove that the skeletons of a woman and a man were there.

All this investigation took place before I came to Duxbury. When I had collected all the evidence I could about the location of the grave of Standish, I came to the conclusion that his skeleton was that found in the second grave opened in April, 1889, by the Duxbury Rural Society. At the same time some of those present on that day in April felt and said that the body was not that of Standish. However, I did not feel discouraged, and my friend, Dr. W. G. Brown, shared my hopes and enthusiasms. Standish's will would indicate that he was

buried as conveniently near as possible to his daughter and his daughter-in-law. I concluded that the searching party of 1889 ought to have opened more graves, and found out if another young woman's skeleton lay near the man's. It is strange, when you think of it, that a company of educated, thoughtful people should have discontinued the search just at the moment when their efforts would have been crowned by success. However, the Duxbury Rural Society prepared the way for the full accomplishment of their desires, and I am glad to say that they all seemed perfectly satisfied, when all the facts were brought to light, that the burial-place was indeed that of Standish and his family. If the Rural Society had not employed Mr. Melzar Brewster to clean up the old cemetery, the stones might not have been found; some one not so careful as Mr. Brewster might have displaced them. Mr. Brewster shared in the accomplishment of what we all sought to do.

My evidence being all prepared, I was anxious to get permission to open the graves. This was the state of the evidence regarding the deaths in Captain Standish's family, including his own, in 1656: his daughter, Lora; his daughter-in-law, Mary (Dingley) Standish; two boys, Charles and John, and, of course, the Captain himself. If the graves were opened we ought very certainly to find

the skeletons of two young women near the skeleton of an old man. What more we might find we could only conjecture. Luckily the evidence about the deaths of the boys had been discovered by me during my researches, and the finding of their little skeletons was a wonderful re-inforcement by evidence from the graves of the evidence from history and tradition, that here we had the last resting-place of Captain Myles Standish and his children.

It was in April, 1891, that Doctor Brown and the writer asked permission from the selectmen of Duxbury to open the graves as we desired. We explained to them the evidence that had come to light, and the selectmen very kindly gave us the desired permission. Of course, we promised that every reverence would be shown the remains, and that only a selected number of witnesses would be on hand. Accordingly on Saturday, the 25th April, 1891, the following persons met around the graves: Mrs. Frederick B. Knapp, Miss Ford, Miss Florence Ford, Miss Stella Jacobs, Miss Zilpha Loring, Miss Clara H. Sampson, Miss Bartlett, (afterwards Mrs. C. N. B. Wheeler), Dr. Wilfred G. Brown, Professor C. N. B. Wheeler, Mr. Charles Bartlett and E. J. V. Huiginn, all of Duxbury, Mr. Logan Waller Page of Richmond, Virginia, and Mr. C. M. Doten of the Old Colony Memorial, Plymouth,

who came later in the afternoon. The gentlemen above named opened a long and deep trench south of and at right angles to the grave of the young woman (Lora Standish) whose grave is marked by the two stones. No trace of a grave was found; the soil was hard for its nature, the deep layers of sand seemed never to have been disturbed.

We next turned our attention to the grave north of the man's grave, at what we supposed would be the natural distance between graves in the same lot, when we found the skeleton of a young woman. She had a great coil of shimmering brown hair which seemed to be full of the healthy gloss of life, and a perfect set of most beautiful teeth, not one missing; in the front the teeth overlapped a little, just enough, perhaps, to make them seem, if anything, more strikingly healthy and strong than if they were in absolutely straight lines. There was not the least scratch on the teeth, nor were the edges in the least worn by usage, the enamel on the edges being sharp and entire. The finger nails, small and rounded, were in place, and parts of the winding-sheet and some of the little black pins used in fastening it were also found. From all indications the body was that of a young woman who had arrived at maturity. The Doctor said that the teeth indicated that she was at least eighteen years of age, for she had

all the teeth an adult of eighteen generally has, and the teeth, not being frayed or worn in any way, showed that she could not have been much over eighteen years of age. This was the skeleton of Mary (Dingley) Standish.

Notwithstanding all the evidence thus brought to light, Doctor Brown and I had a feeling that we should like to open the ground north of Mary Standish's grave, and also the two other graves at whose opening we had not been present in 1889. We wanted to see for ourselves what evidence for age, size, or physical characteristics, we could gather from the remains in those graves opened in 1889. With this end in view we again sought permission from the selectmen to continue our work in the cemetery. We obtained the desired permission, and on Tuesday, 12th May, 1891, the following persons were present in the little cemetery:—Mrs. Frederick B. Knapp, Miss Ford, Miss Clara H. Sampson, Miss Stella Jacobs, all of Duxbury; Miss Ellen L. Sampson of Newton, Mass.; also, Dr. Wilfred G. Brown and Mr. Frederick B. Knapp, of Duxbury; Mr. Logan Waller Page of Richmond, Virginia; Mr. Frederick Stout of Auburn, New York; Mr. Hosmer K. Arnold of Portland, Oregon; and Mr. Hammond Braman of Cohasset, Massachusetts; Mr. C. M. Doten of the Old Colony Memorial of Plymouth came a little later, also Miss

Caroline B. Hall. The writer, too, was present.

We opened the ground in what was evidently the same lot, and north of the grave of the young woman with the brown hair, when we found the bodies of two boys. One of these boys, the one next to Mary Dingley Standish, was, from all indications, about nine years of age. Dr. Brown said the size of the bones gave a fair indication of his age; the second growth of teeth was coming in, crushing out the first set; several of the new teeth were in place, and in several places the two rows of teeth were present, both the new ones and the old; the hair still on the head, was cropped short. Everything showed that it was a boy's skeleton. The other child, lying in a grave north of the boy's grave just described, was younger, and Doctor Brown said that from the bones and teeth he would conclude that the child was at least three or four years of age, and might be five or six. The Doctor and all present considered this smaller skeleton to be also that of a boy; all the indications, as the cropped hair, pointed that way.

To the north of the second boy's grave, we opened a trench of several feet and probed the ground above, and through the sides of the trench, with sharp-pointed iron bars, and we could find no indication of another grave in the vicinity of these five. It may


not be known that what we may call virgin ground will offer far greater resistance to a sharp-pointed bar or other instrument than ground that has been opened up at any time. In the little cemetery, there never was any digging except for the making of graves, and the graves can be rather easily located by this method.

Having fully satisfied ourselves that there were no more graves north of the little boy's in the lot, (we searched for a distance of several feet), we turned our attention to the graves of the man and the young woman on his right hand, lying to the south of his grave. All the bodies lay with their heads to the west.

And first, as to the man's skeleton. Every care was taken not to disturb the position of the remains as they lay in the ground. We were so particular about the matter, that when we reached the first appearance of the coffin, all larger tools were dropped and the sand was removed by small shovels or scoops, and even with the hands. When the remains were fully exposed, the skeleton was found in a wonderful state of preservation. All the large bones were there and almost all the little ones. The body was measured as it lay in the grave and it measured five feet seven inches; this is the same measurement as that taken in 1889. The Doctor took charge of ex-

arranging and measuring the bones. He declared that the bones indicated a man of tremendous physique and strength. He carefully placed all the bones on some rugs spread over boards. The skull was large, well-developed, and of a peculiar formation: it was remarkably broad from ear to ear, and more than remarkably long from the front of the forehead to the back of the head, so that it must have projected quite a distance beyond the nape of the neck. There was a quantity of hair on the skull: the hair was rather sparse on the front of the head and was of a reddish-brown color mixed with gray, and a little whitish hair was found where the head lay. The chin-arch was square and strong, and what I may call the rear angle of the chin was somewhat similarly shaped: the forehead proper was broad and not very high. There was one tooth in the lower jaw showing all the signs of age: all the other teeth were missing and the cavities that once held them were all filled with ossified matter, showing, as Doctor Brown said, that it was the body of an old man, as the teeth must have been lost before his death and the ossified matter have had time to form. The shoulder bones and ribs indicated a powerful physique. Doctor Brown most carefully examined all these details while we all stood by and some of us made notes of his statements. These

FRONT



LEFT

RIGHT

BASE

THE SEVEN OF JULY 1898
FROM THE 1898



notes I have now before me. Some measurements of the Captain's skull were taken by Doctor Brown in 1891; the skull was 21 inches above the occipital protuberance, it was $21\frac{1}{2}$ inches around, it was $14\frac{1}{2}$ inches over the parietal bone from the bottom of the petrus portion of the parietal bone. Photographs were taken of the skull, for it struck all of us as being peculiarly shaped. There were some descendants of Standish at the grave and, knowing them personally, I drew attention to the similarity in the formation of the heads. Of course, I did this with all due apologies, and I was repaid for my observation by the politeness and courtesy of those to whom I referred, for one of them at least allowed the Doctor to examine the shape of her head; it was Miss Caroline B. Hall. The formations were very similar, the Doctor said.

Both I and others have observed that the same characteristics in the formation of the head are found today in several of the living descendants of the Captain. We placed the remains in a new coffin and re-buried with all due reverence all that was left of the famous Captain of Plymouth. Large parts of the original coffin were in a good state of preservation, the boards being quite thick; these, of course, we placed in the grave about and on top of the new coffin; fragments of the winding-sheet were found,

and some of those present thought they could discover lines of coloring in the material. I read part of the burial service from the book of Common Prayer, as we all felt unusually quiet and even solemn. Here were the remains of the man who had done so much for Plymouth Colony and consequently for all of us. The man who could wield Gideon, and face Pecksuot in the hand-to-hand fight in the little house or hut at Wesagusset, needed to be strong, determined, courageous. His remains indicated these qualities.

On the same day we also opened the grave on the Captain's right hand; this had been opened in 1889, and was the grave between the two famous pyramidal stones. The body measured five feet two inches as it lay in the ground: this is the same measurement that was taken in 1889. It was more than evident that this was the body of a young woman. She had a splendid coil of light-colored hair; she had all the teeth an adult of eighteen years usually has; not one was missing. These teeth were perfect and looked like pearls for finish; there was not a scratch on them, nor was the enamel on the edges or elsewhere in the least worn; the edges were not flattened at all by usage. From the fact that she had all the teeth an adult of about eighteen years of age usually has, it was evident she

must have been about that age, and from the fact that there was no sign of wear on the teeth, she could not have been much older.

The formation of the skull of this young woman was exactly like the formation of the skull of the man on her left,—broad between the ears, long from the front of the forehead to the back of the head, protruding quite a distance behind the nape of the neck, with a broad, low forehead. Everyone remarked the very striking similarity in the shape of these two skulls. Parts of the winding-sheet were found, and, as it were, of a veil or lighter fabric about the head, while some thought they observed lines of color running through the remnants of the winding-sheet. We placed the remains in a new coffin, and re-buried them with all due reverence. We all were convinced that this was the resting-place of Lora Standish.

The skull of the young woman on the Captain's left hand was totally unlike the Captain's and Lora's in conformation.

CHAPTER XIII

Having possession of the evidence from the graves, let us see how this evidence corresponds with the facts about the Standish family.

From Standish's will we know that he was to be buried beside his daughter, Lora, and his daughter-in-law, Mary. From the same source we conclude that his son, John, died young. But we can prove that Charles and John died young, even apart from the will. In the lists of the freemen of the town, in the lists of those who were sixteen years of age made at various times, and in the lists of those admitted to the freedom of the town, there is no mention of the names of Charles and John Standish. The list of those who were sixteen years of age in 1643 contains the name of Alexander Standish. This list may be seen in volume eight, page 190, of the Plymouth Colony Records. Mr. Justin Winsor gives the list on page 92 of his History of Duxbury, but omits the name of Alexander Standish. We know that Charles and John Standish were born before the 22d May, 1627, and this list of persons between sixteen and sixty years of age capable of bearing arms was drawn up in August, 1643. If Charles and John were

then alive and capable of bearing arms they would have been mentioned. It is probable that they were dead before this time. Their names are mentioned only once in the old records and that is in 1627. These boys were alive in 1627, and very soon the Captain moved to Duxbury. All the probabilities are that these boys died in Duxbury and were buried in the graveyard in Duxbury. It must be borne in mind that the burial place of these boys is not of direct importance in the question about the Captain's grave. We are simply concerned to find an old man buried near two young women, and the traditions about the burial place of Standish point out these graves.

From the skeletons we see that the young women found in the traditional burying place were, according to the evidence from the graves, about eighteen years of age and could not have been much more. Let us now examine the evidence about the ages of Lora and Mary Standish.

Lora Standish was not born before the 22nd May, 1627. This we know. After that date several children were born to Standish; at least four were born, one being Lora, and the other three being the sons, Myles, Josias, and the second Charles, who is mentioned in the will. From the records we know that Standish had these children, Charles, Alexander, John, Myles,

Josias, Lora, and the Charles mentioned as the youngest son in the will. The first Charles is mentioned first in the formal list given of the allotment of cattle on pages 50-57 of

"Plimoths great book of deeds of land
Enrolled: from An°. 1627 to An°. 1651"

It is in this record that Captain Standish, his wife, Barbara, and his three sons, Charles, Alexander, and John, (given in this order), are mentioned in the groups to whom the cattle were allotted. In the Standish group were thirteen persons, and to them were allotted a red cow and her calf, (a bull), and two she-goats. The bull was to be kept for the advantage of all the colonists. That the Charles of "Plimoths great book of deeds" was not the Charles of the will is very evident to anyone considering the claims of Standish to large estates in England kept from him, though belonging to him by right of his birth. Such a man would be a stickler for all the forms and rights on which his own claims depended. The list of 1627 was, without question, supplied by himself, and he would give the names in the order of their birth. This Charles of the 1627 record died and John died, and both of them died, as all circumstantial evidence would prove, before they became sixteen years of age. They are not mentioned in any other record so far discovered. They are not on the lists

of freemen, of military companies, of landholders, or on any other list.

The Charles in the 1627 record is the oldest born child of the Captain. That is plain. No one has the right to go behind the records and claim they are wrong. Standish was not only the military chief of the Colony, but he held magisterial positions, as we know, and even officiated at marriages. He would have submitted the list of his own family. He would have been one of the men advising in the question of the allotment of cattle. He would have been acquainted with the order of the names on the list. Their leading men, as Edward Winslow and Morton, would have known that he belonged to a distinguished family, and he would have been treated with all courtesy, although it is certain he would not have claimed any exemptions from the customary laws and regulations of the colonists. I do not see any justification whatever for the list of the Captain's family as given by Charles Henry Pope in his book. Mr. Pope places the children of the 1627 list in this order: Alexander, Charles, Myles. Why? For no good historical reason, for all the history we have is against this arrangement, and if one throws doubt on the record as given in "Plimoths great book of deeds," then one has no authority to rest on in the matter. I would suspect the quotations and

authority of any writer who would so change such valuable records as those of "Plimoths great book." But I feel that Mr. Pope was led to make this arrangement of the children's names because it never entered his head that the Charles of the 1627 record and the Charles of the will were different children. If the Charles of the will were the same as the Charles of 1627, then in the will he ought to have been mentioned first, as the heir of the Captain's hereditary lands, and as receiving the double portion of land in New England. But the Charles of the will is mentioned as the youngest of the four sons living at the date of the will, and he is not even mentioned as an executor. Why not, unless he is either very sickly, or mentally unbalanced, or under age, or under the severe displeasure of his father? This last supposition is out of all question, considering the affection and deep religious feeling shown in the will. Even if he were sick or mentally unbalanced, the father would have mentioned his name at least before the names of Myles and Josias in the will, for the Charles of 1627 was certainly older than Myles or Josias. You cannot tamper with the record of the "Plimoth great book," nor with the record of the Captain's will. You will have to sustain them and reconcile them in the most natural and obvious way. Is there such a way? There certainly is. Governor

Bradford gives us this record of Standish's family. We shall let the record speak for itself. He says twice in the body of his report that he is writing it after he had seen thirty years completed in the new world. Here is his statement about the Standishes:—

“Captain Standish his wife dyed in the first sicknes, and he married againe, and hath 4. sones liveing, and some are dead.”

Who are the four sons living in 1651? Doubtless, the four mentioned in the will, Alexander, Myles, Josias, and Charles.

Who are included in the “some are dead?” Without question, more than one son was dead. It is my persuasion that the Charles and John of the record of 1627 were dead before Bradford penned his record at the end of his life of thirty years in the colony. When you carefully read that list given by Bradford, I am certain you will agree with me that I am not straining the records to bear out my views. I am altogether certain that I was the first person to draw attention to the two boys of the same name, Charles, the disappearance of the one, and the most unaccountable complication that arises in the case of both, unless we find a satisfactory explanation. That explanation is simple. The first Charles, the first-born son of the Captain, died when young, and John died when young, and these two are included in Brad-

ford's concise statement that Standish "hath 4. sones liveing, and some are dead." We ask, some what? Some sons, very clearly; at least two. As the years went by and other sons were born, the Captain and his wife, remembering their first-born, the heir of all his estates and rights in England had he lived, called their youngest son by the same name. It is often done, very often done, as we know. In this way the records are shown to be correct, and the Charles of the will as the youngest son, most probably not yet of age, is given his due place by his father in the will as the youngest of his four surviving sons. Had the Charles of the record of 1627 been alive, he would undoubtedly have been the lawful heir of all the Captain's hereditary rights. Had he been alive, and if we were even to allow that he was not the first-born son, (we contend he was) he would certainly have been mentioned in the will before Myles and Josias. I am confident that Mr. Pope made his mistake through not being able to reconcile the statement of the will that, when it was made, Alexander was the eldest surviving son and lawful heir of the Captain's hereditary rights, and Charles placed as the youngest. Mr. Pope saw the one he believed to be the oldest son, the Charles of 1627, placed in the position of the youngest son in the will. I confess that this difficulty puzzled me not a little in 1891, but not

being bound to prove a theory, and not feeling free to tamper with the records, I concluded that the first-born son, Charles, died in youth, as well as John, and that in loving remembrance of their first child his parents called a younger son by the same name.

I feel in a way disappointed that a member of the Standish family should have adopted Mr. Pope's arrangement of the births in the Captain's family; it is unwarranted. It makes all documentary evidence valueless, or at least has a large tendency that way. Perhaps it was thought that there was a point to be made from the language of the Captain's will, where he says in paragraph five, "My will is that my eldest son Allexander shall have a double share in land," and in the last paragraph where he says, "I give unto my son and heire aparent Allexander Standish," etc. No point could be made from this language, except that Alexander was the eldest surviving son at the date of the will. But there most certainly is no proof whatever that he was the first-born son of the Captain. As the eldest surviving son at that date "Allexander" was naturally and legally the Captain's heir apparent to all his hereditary rights. Maybe it was thought desirable for some reason to make it appear that the first-born son of the Captain did survive him, and that may

have had some influence on those who changed the order given in 1627. Personally, I would not change a date, nor an order of names, given, evidently by the Captain himself, for any reason whatever, unless I knew from most indisputable sources that the record was wrong.

Let us return to the question of Lora Standish's age.

We have seen that Bradford declares that in 1651 Standish had only four children living, and these were all sons, the four mentioned in the Captain's will. To show more clearly the full value of Bradford's evidence, we give his own statement about his purpose in making this record. On page 534 of the Bradford History, printed by order of the General Court of Massachusetts in 1898, we find this statement of Bradford:—

"And seeing it hath pleased him to give me to see 30. years compleated since these beginings; and that the great works of his providence are to be observed, I have thought it not unworthy my paines to take a view of the increasings & decreasings of these persons, and such changs as hath passed over them & theirs, in this thirty years. It may be of some use to such as come after; but, however, I shall reste in my owne benefite.

"I will therfore take them in order as they lye."

Here then we have Governor Bradford's distinct statement that thirty years after the beginnings of the Colony, he thinks it worth while to give a list of the Mayflower Pilgrims and their descendants. In the list he records of the Standish family as already stated.

Is it not likely that Bradford knew how many children Standish had living? Is it not likely that he knew that Lora was already dead? He says Standish had only four sons living in 1651, after the thirty years had been completed. The two words, "*are dead,*" are in italics in the printed copy, perhaps indicating that these words are not in Bradford's hand writing, or they may have been underlined in the Mss. by the Governor himself for some special reason. No explanation of the italics is given. Bradford was Governor for most of his years in Plymouth. Standish was the military chieftain. Who would say that Bradford did not know of the family of Standish and the losses he had suffered by death? It will not do to say that Bradford made the mistake of saying that only twelve of the original Mayflower people were alive in 1679, as some writers have said. Bradford was dead twenty years before that date, and some have attributed to him the notes added in a different handwriting in 1679. Bradford distinctly states in 1650 or 1651, when he drew up his list of survivors of the

Mayflower Pilgrims and their descendants, that about thirty of the "old stock" were then alive.

This invaluable record of Governor Bradford altogether simplifies the question of Lora Standish's death, and settles the question of the deaths of "some" of the Captain's "sones" before 1651.

Anyone who studies Bradford's list of Mayflower survivors and their descendants will see that it was carefully prepared. He set it to himself as a solemn task, that might instruct the future, and at least would give "benefit" to himself, to prepare this list. He mentions in the cases of other families the surviving daughters, but he does not mention any daughter as surviving to Standish in 1651. Is it because he knew nothing of Standish's family? Is it because the young girl's existence had never been known to him? Not at all: it was simply that Lora was dead when the list was drawn up by Bradford.

Lora, then, was dead in 1651. When was she born? There is no record; at least no record has yet been discovered. Her mother, Barbara, whose last name is still unknown, came to America in the latter part of July, or early in August, in 1623. She came in the same ship, the *Anne*, with Fear and Patience Brewster and others. We do not know when she and the Captain

were married. But they must have been married before the distribution of land in 1614, for her name is given in the document list as Mrs. Barbara Standish for the sale of land.

It would seem that I might say here that though Mrs. Standish is given and in 1614 no land is given to Francis Adams, whether in her own name or in the name of Mrs. Allen. John and Francis Allen are mentioned in the document of date 1614. Perhaps this may shed a little light on the circumstance mentioned by Longfellow's poem.

But to return to our task. We know that by the time May 1617 came the sons Charles, Alexander and John had been born to the Standishes. We know that after that time at least four more children were born to them, and they are usually given in this order: Mary, John, Peter and Charles, the second of the name. Now the question is, "Was Peter the first second child or fourth of these children?" The Standishes and others usually place her as the third of these four children. The Boston Standish of Boston places her second in the list qualified in the family genealogy.

Let us consider this question in a different way and following the suggestion which is presented by the order in the Standish family from the time of the second marriage.

to the 22d May, 1627. We may allow a period of three years and one half, but, certainly, not four years, and in that period three children were born to the Captain. If in the next four years three children should have been born to the Captain, and Lora were one of them, then she would have been old enough to do the work exhibited in Plymouth, and to meet the demands of tradition as to her age. We do not have to strain dates. But we shall consider the question of the date of Lora's birth in every way possible, consistent with the data we have.

The Captain and his second wife could not have been married before the end of July, or the beginning of August, 1623. Three children are recorded on the 22nd May, 1627. The period between these dates is practically forty-six months. This would allow an interval of fifteen months between the marriage and the birth of the first child, Charles, and fifteen months between his birth and Alexander's, and fifteen between Alexander's and John's. Of course, it is not likely that the Captain was married at once on Barbara's arrival, but we are supposing the most extreme possibility in the circumstances; the probability is not so extreme. Nor is it likely that the intervening time between the births was just fifteen months, or thereabouts, in all the cases. But ac-

according to this supposition, the youngest of the three children mentioned on the 22nd May, 1627, would have been born about the beginning of May, 1627.

Now, if we allow the same interval of fifteen months between the births of the other children, and between John's and the first of all born after his birth, we can easily see that the four children we know about that is Myles, Josias, Lora and Charles (the second of the name) would all have been born by May, 1632. If Lora, then, were the oldest of those born after May, 1627, she would (—allowing the longest possible average interval in the case of the three oldest children—) have been born about August, 1628. If she were the second child of the last four children, she would have been born about November, 1629. If she were the third child of these last four children, she would have been born about February, 1631. Finally if she were the youngest of the four she would have been born about May, 1632.

It is easy to see that Lora could have been the fourth, the fifth, the sixth, or the seventh, child of the Captain, and yet have years enough to grow into the young lady we hear of in the traditions of Duxbury and Plymouth, have shown her skill in needlework, as displayed in Pilgrim Hall, Plymouth, and yet have departed this life before 1651,

when Governor Bradford wrote his record of the Pilgrims and their descendants. There is no valid reason for supposing that a longer average time intervened between the births of the third child and the fourth, and the fourth and the fifth, and so on, simply because there is a record that three were born before May 22nd, 1627.

Of course, if you delay the marriage of Standish and Barbara, you shorten the intervals between the births, and you leave my argument as to Lora's age untouched. Her birth at any date between May, 1627, and the latest date our longest average period between the births can yield, will still leave it altogether reasonable that she could have been a young woman at the time of her death before Bradford's list was compiled.

The longer you postpone the Captain's second marriage, and the older you make John, the youngest of the three children living in May, 1627, then the shorter the intervals between the births of these first three children. One would then be reasonably justified in shortening the periods between the remaining births in the Captain's family, unless positive contradictory evidence as to dates can be established.

I think that enough has been said to show that Lora Standish would have had a long enough life in which to become the young lady we all know her to have been,

and yet not to be so old at her death as to have had her wonderful teeth frayed or scratched in the least. The skeleton of the young woman with the light-colored hair, the strikingly-shaped head, and the beautiful teeth is without question that of Lora Standish.

In all that we have said about the number of children born to the Captain and his wife, Barbara, before the 22nd May, 1627, we have not lost sight of the fact that the Captain went to England in the latter part of 1625, and returned in April, 1626.

Even if one were disposed to say that Bradford's list of 1651 does not afford evidence of Lora's death at that time,—though personally I feel sure that she was not living when he wrote his list of Mayflower survivors and their children,—still it is evident that she was dead before the Captain made his will. As she was the third child born to him after 1627, it is very clear that there would be sufficient time for her to grow to girlhood, and young womanhood even, before the date on the will. I have a feeling that some day some one will find in this country, or in England, documentary evidence about the Captain's family, and the dates of their birth and death.

CHAPTER XIV

So far no record has been found of the birth of any of the Captain's children.

Alexander became a freeman in June, 1648. He had given notice the previous year that he would apply for the freeman's rights and privileges at the general election court of June, 1648. But this would not prove that Alexander was only twenty-one years of age in 1648. To argue so, would be to declare that Alexander was born in 1627, and we know that he was born, must have been born, at least before August, 1626.

We have not any record of when Josias became a freeman. We do know that he is entered as a freeman with Alexander in the list of Duxbury freemen in 1658, and Josias is also entered in the Bridgewater list of freemen for the same year. But this would not prove that Josias was only twenty-one years old in 1658; far from it indeed, for he must have been twenty-one when the Captain appointed him an executor on the 7th March, 1655, and indeed it is more than likely that he was twenty-one, or more, when he was married in 1654. As noted elsewhere, it is altogether more than probable that Josias was born before 1630.

I have seen a record made in 1895, by one of the descendants of the Captain, that Josias was born in 1634. This is simply conjecture, and may be a deduction from the fact that he is named as an executor in the Captain's will. But there is not any good foundation for such conjecture, the strongest probabilities being all in favor of an earlier date for the birth of Josias, as we have stated. If Josias were born in 1634, he could not at the earliest date have become a free-man until June, 1655, and then he would have to be twenty-one years of age; he could not, then, have been a freeman when his father's will was drawn in March, 1655, unless, as I elsewhere observe, we take this to mean March of the ecclesiastical and legal year of 1655, which would mean the historical year of 1656. You can gather nothing about the age of Josias from the Captain's will, nor from any other source, to justify you in saying that he was born in 1634.

We now come to the question of the age of Mary Dingley, the first wife of Josias Standish, the third surviving son of Captain Standish. Mary Dingley is said to have been the daughter of John Dingley, who at one time lived in Lynn and Sandwich, but later was admitted a freeman of Marshfield in 1644. In the sixth volume of the New England Genealogical Register it is said

that she and Josias were married on the 19th December, 1654. She was dead before Captain Standish made his will on the 7th March, 1655. According to this her married life was very brief. The Marshfield records, according to some, place the date of her death on the 1st July, 1665; this, of course, is a mistake of a copyist. Others quote the Marshfield record as saying she died the first of July, 1655. To me there is no difficulty in admitting that the 7th March, 1655, on Standish's will may mean, (if we consider the Captain as using the civil, legal, and ecclesiastical way of counting the years), the 7th March, 1656, as we count the years. Thus we get rid of a seeming contradiction.

Marshfield was originally part of Duxbury. Some writers say that the name of Mary's father was "perhaps" John, as if they had some doubt about it, but this is of no moment in our present question. It is also said in the record of her death that her brother John was buried eight days after she was buried. When I met this record, not having seen the Bradford History at that time, I had half a fear that this might mean her brother-in-law, John Standish, but the Bradford History plainly shows that he was dead before 1651, and so the John mentioned in the record of Mary Standish's death and funeral cannot be John Standish.

We have no record of Mary Standish's birth. We can only arrive at a most probable estimate of her age at the time of her death. She was married to Josias Standish in December, 1654. In so far as the records go he was the fifth son of the Captain, and taking into account the tradition that he was older than Lora, then he would be the fifth child. This is as far as we can go as to his place in his own family. We know that he was born some time after May, 1627, being the second child born to the Captain after that date. If we keep in mind what has been said on the question of Lora's birth, we are not unjustified in saying that Josias was born about November, 1629. This would make him about twenty-five years of age when he was married. His wife was in all probability a little younger than he was, and her age thus estimated would make it altogether probable, if not absolutely certain, that the skeleton of the young woman with the brown hair and the perfect but slightly overlapping teeth, found on Captain Standish's left hand in the cemetery was the skeleton of Mary Dingley Standish.

CHAPTER XV

Perhaps it will not be amiss to say a few words as to the dates on some of the old records.

We must keep in mind that some writers have transferred the dates of the Old Style, in vogue before England adopted the Gregorian Calendar, to the New Style of dating. This, for instance, would account for Governor Bradford's statement that Rose Standish died on the 29th January, 1621, (O.S.), while others say she died on the 8th February, 1621, (N.S.). We must also keep in mind that the historical year began on the 1st January, while the civil, legal, and ecclesiastical year began on the 25th March. England did not adopt the Gregorian Calendar until 1751. Now if Standish, as is likely, used the "civil, legal, and ecclesiastical" method of reckoning, his "7th March, 1655," on his will, would be really for us the 7th March, 1656, and if he used the Old Style of dating, then, for us, with the New Style, the date of his will would be the 17th March, 1656. To me it seems altogether likely that Standish, as well as Bradford and very many of the Pilgrims, used the "civil, legal, and ecclesiastical" year and the Old Style of counting the days of the months. As

the date of Standish's will is the 7th March, 1655, it follows, if I am correct in my surmise, that the will really was made in 1656. This, of course, would permit us to hold to the date 1 July, 1655, for Mary Standish's death, for it was only that part of the year between the 1st January, and the 25th March, that counted as the closing months of the civil, legal, and ecclesiastical year, and from the 26th March to the 31st December, the year would have been the same for both the historical year and the civil, legal, and ecclesiastical one. Anyone who is familiar with the old records will at once see what I mean. Thus in a Duxbury record signed by Alexander Standish, Town Clerk, the date is given "17th February, 1699-700." Again we have the record of the town-meeting in Duxbury to raise funds to build their new meeting-house, and the date is given "March y^e 20th 170 5-6." Another Duxbury town-meeting is dated "Feb. 25, anno 170 6-7." Yet another, "16th of February anno dom. 170 7-8." Sometimes, the year for January, February, and March to the 25th, is written thus, e.g., 16 February 170 $\frac{7}{8}$. Examples of this way of dating are numerous in all old records.

CHAPTER XVI

We have now thoroughly examined the question of the ages of Lora Standish and Mary Dingley Standish. The Captain's age is determined for us by the records which speak of him as "a man full of years," and as "growing very ancient." The Pilgrims were in the habit of taking the "three-score years and ten" of the Psalmist, as being old. Bradford speaks of himself as an old man at sixty-seven; Bradford died in his sixty-ninth year. The ages then of Captain Standish and of Lora and Mary would bear out the tradition that the graves opened are those of Standish and his children. Before his own death two of his sons had died young, and his daughter, Lora, and his daughter-in-law, Mary. He had asked to be buried with his daughter and his daughter-in-law. He was buried between them. It seems likely to me that he purposely left a place for his own grave between those of his beloved Lora and Mary. Tradition has always pointed out the place; the locations of the homes of the first three ministers from 1637 to 1700 were near the spot; the old roads all converged there; the farm boundaries all locate the church there from the beginning; the public land was there; the foundations of the first two churches are there, the first one in the south-east

corner of the old graveyard, and the second one on the eastern side of the old road that bounds the graveyard on the east. All these positive proofs show that in the first public graveyard Standish and his children were buried. In fact those who would bury him elsewhere, would bury him beside the first church and nowhere else. We have found that he was buried beside the first church and nowhere else, and we have shown where the first church was. The notion that he was buried elsewhere is simply imaginary.

Taking into account the few hundred people buried in that old cemetery, and that there would not be one chance out of many millions of finding such another combination of graves as the above, exactly corresponding to the first five deaths in the Standish family, it does not seem that there is any room for doubt. Taking all the evidence into account, with the traditions, there is absolutely no room for doubt.

Before proceeding, it may be permitted us to explain somewhat further what we know about Captain Standish's age. An attempt was one time made to find the record of his birth in England. It is said that he was christened in the parish of Chorley. The records of this parish are complete from 1549 to 1652, except for the years 1584-5. This portion of the records has been so mutilated that there is no trace of the dates

and names left. Perhaps some of our modern inventions would help to decipher what was written on these disfigured records. It is said that the date of his commission as an officer in the English army would indicate that he was born in 1584 or 1585. Who ever saw this commission? Generally a man had to be twenty-one years of age before he received a commission. Some say his commission was granted him in Queen Elizabeth's time. If so, and if he were twenty-one when he received it, he must have been at least seventy-four years of age at his death, for Queen Elizabeth died on the 24th March, 1603. If he received his commission at some earlier period than March, 1603, and if he were 21 years old at the time, then he would be older than we have said at the time of his death. Perhaps some day the exact dates may be discovered. At all events we have enough information to show that he was an old man at the time of his death. But we must observe that if he were twenty-one when he received his commission, and that he received it in Queen Elizabeth's time, then he was not born in 1584 or 1585, but earlier, and the mutilated records for 1584 and 1585 would have no bearing on his birth. Perhaps he was not twenty-one when he received his commission, or his commission may have been given to him after Elizabeth's time.

CHAPTER XVII

We now come to the objections raised in this question. I would rather not mention the names of those who raised the objections, but in all fairness to the public and to myself I think these names must be mentioned. Some of the objectors at one time at least had a number of readers who very greatly relied on the authority of the objectors. Prominent among the objectors was Mrs. Jane G. Austin, the author of some interesting Pilgrim stories about a generation ago. Mrs. Austin, because of her popularity as a writer of these books of fiction, had a following all her own; what she said, they believed and said. I met Mrs. Austin's objections at the time in the Boston Transcript and the Old Colony Memorial of Plymouth. I would pass by all these objections at present, only I know that some day some very enthusiastic "antiquarian" will very likely find copies of those papers in which Mrs. Austin made her objections and deluge the community with "documents never before discovered," and "evidence and facts never before brought to light," and "objections that never have been answered." I feel obliged, then, to meet all objections and give my answers here in permanent form.

It is a pleasure to say that a well-known Boston woman, who is equally well, or, perhaps better, known in Duxbury, told me that Mrs. Austin in her latter days considered the evidence I had published in a pamphlet in 1892, and said to the close companion of her last days, that she was sorry she had ever raised any objection, and that she then felt that I was correct in all my conclusions. This was a great satisfaction to me at the time and always has been since.

Another objector was Mr. Stephen M. Allen. Mr. Allen's objections have already been answered where we deal with the so-called "Chandler-farm theory." It will be sufficient then to quote the following from a letter of Mr. Allen to the Boston Herald. The letter is dated from South Duxbury, May 24, 1891. The portion I wish to quote is this: "If three graves answering the description of the Captain's will were found in the old grounds of the First Church, near the shore, it would be almost conclusive evidence that the last resting-place of the valiant soldier was there."

One objection, raised by a descendant of Standish, was that it cannot be shown that the graveyard where Standish was buried was in use before 1697, or thereabouts. The proof of this is that the oldest gravestone found is dated for that year. Even if we granted that there was no gravestone

of earlier date than 1697, this would simply prove that Jonathan Alden, whose grave it marked, died in 1697; it would not prove that the stone was placed there in 1697; it would be no proof at all of the exact age of the graveyard. The oldest tombstone in Marshfield, in fact in the Colony, is marked 1651, but this will not prove that the graveyard was not in use before that time. The oldest stone in Plymouth burying ground is dated 1681, but no one thinks of proving from this that the graveyard was not in use long before 1681. There is the very strongest and most positive evidence that the graveyard where Standish lies buried is the first graveyard of the town, and remained in use until about 1783, when the site of the church was changed to the site of the present Unitarian church, or near that site; then the present graveyard was first used, the graveyard following the church. It must not be forgotten that the first settlers were too busy at work on the new country, and in defending their lives from all dangers, to be able to spend much time and money on graveyards and gravestones. Only the richer people were able to have tombstones, and these were mostly imported.

Another objection made by the same person is that the stones marked the grave of Lora and not of Myles. The two graves are along side of each other. It is most likely

that Myles marked his only daughter's grave; she was likely his favorite child. Afterwards when he was buried beside her, it would have been easy for people to transfer the connection between these remarkable stones and Lora's grave to the grave of her famous father. Before the Captain's death people would have said that Lora's grave was marked by the stones; after her father's death they would have said that the Captain's grave was just beside these stones, or his burial place was marked by them. The two graves are very close together. The stones are heavy, and could not have been easily displaced. The stones, when found, exactly marked the grave of Lora Standish, the Captain's daughter.

Another objection by the same objector is that the length of the man's skeleton was so great as to prove that it could not be Myles Standish. A French traveler, this objection states, is the only eye witness who has left us an account of the Captain's size, and he says the Captain was a small man; therefore it is concluded, the Captain's skeleton could not measure five feet seven inches in the grave. In the first place, the Frenchman is not the only one who has left us an account of the Captain's size; in the second place, even if the Captain was small, De Rassiere does not say he was a dwarf. De Rassiere, or De Rasieres, or De Razier, was the

representative of the Dutch Plantation at Hudson River who came to Plymouth in October, 1627, with letters from the Dutch offering terms of friendship to the Pilgrims. The letters were signed by this Isaac De Razier, as Secretary. Thirdly, a man five feet seven inches would be a small man; but what is more to the point is, that when a human body disintegrates in the grave, the bones fall apart and are crushed apart by the decayed coffin lid and the crushing earth, so that the skeleton in the grave is generally longer than the living man would be. A disarticulated skeleton measuring five feet seven inches would be a good deal longer than the Captain in life.

Young in his "Chronicles of the Pilgrims," in a footnote on page 126, says: "The Plymouth soldier was a man of small stature, but of such an active and daring spirit that he spread terror through all the Indian tribes from Massachusetts Bay to Martha's Vineyard, and from Cape Cod Harbor to Narraganset."

Dr. James Thacher in his History of Plymouth, page 113, writes: "Captain Standish, it is said, was of small stature, but of a fiery temper, and perhaps no man ever possessed a more daring and intrepid spirit."

I am happy to say that the person offering these last three objections withdrew them when he had received some enlightenment.

It has been cause for wonder with some that no jewelry was found in any of the graves. It is very unlikely that Captain Standish, a soldier of fortune before he came here, would have any great quantity of jewelry. Even if he had, the simple and religious notions of the people would have been opposed to burying jewelry with the dead. It was the custom of the Pilgrims to encourage simplicity of life and dress at all times, and their dead were buried reverently but with simplicity. Absence of jewelry is what we should expect.

CHAPTER XVIII

Mrs. Jane G. Austin is the one who makes the greatest number of objections to our conclusions and to our proofs. It is necessary to consider her objections one by one, that all sides of this question may be seen, and all the proofs and objections fully considered.

Her objections will be found in her letters to the Boston Transcript of June 2, 1891, and July 3, 1891, and in the Old Colony Memorial of Plymouth of June 13, 1891.

1. She says the five graves found are not of one family.

Ans. This is assumed without a personal examination of the graves, the skeletons, and of the documentary and other proof on hand. Every candid observer admits that the graves are of one family.

2. "As for the five graves lying in a row it proves positively nothing at all."

Ans. As for the five graves, they prove that an old man was buried between two young women, and that a boy and a child were buried in the same row. They prove that the skull of the man is very like the skull of the young woman on his right hand side, and that these skulls are very like the skull of one of the direct descendants of

Standish, recently living in Duxbury; all these heads have a peculiar shape or conformation. The graves were found with skeletons corresponding to the first five deaths in the Captain's family, and with the skeletons bearing out the historical testimony as to age and sex, and also as to the positions of the graves of the old man and the two young women. These graves were found in what tradition and history point out as the first graveyard, and the two famous triangular pyramids of stone were marking the place.

3. The two boys, Charles and John, died of plague in Plymouth in 1632-33. Therefore they are buried in Plymouth.

Ans. This is gratuitous assumption. Nobody can prove that the boys died in Plymouth, or died of the plague. We are justified in maintaining that the graves of the boy and of the child are those of Charles and John Standish, as long as we can prove that their father and his daughter and daughter-in-law are buried in the same place. The evidence will prove that the Standish family was living in Duxbury during the plague and not in Plymouth. The plague was in the hot season, but Standish then lived in Duxbury. We have already quoted that document signed by him and others in April, 1632, promising to return to Plymouth in the winter season. They must have been in Duxbury in the summer of 1632, and

during each summer afterwards. In fact there is nothing to prove that the men who signed that document did return to Plymouth in the winter; the churches divided in 1632, and there are other proofs that the document was never enforced.

Even if Standish were in Plymouth when the plague broke out, would it not be most reasonable to suppose that he would at once remove his family to Duxbury? Were we to grant that the Standish boys died in Plymouth, which we do not admit, would not their father bring their bodies to be buried in Duxbury, where he intended to make his home for the remainder of his life? Mrs. Austin suggests that Standish would not have removed his children to Duxbury when they were sick of the plague. She writes: "But if Standish's two sons died of the sickness in 1633, it was highly improbable that their father carried them away from the vicinity of Dr. Fuller then in Plymouth and who was the only physician of the colony." Here Mrs. Austin assumes that the boys died in 1633, of the plague, in Plymouth, and were buried there. Then she assumes that it had been suggested, that Standish removed the plague-stricken boys during their illness from the care of Dr. Fuller! No one ever thought of such a thing. Even if his children did live in Duxbury, the settlers in Duxbury would

all have to call upon Dr. Fuller in their illness until they secured a physician nearer home. Everyone knows that Dr. Fuller did go to Marshfield, and to greater distances than Duxbury, to attend sick people. He even went as far as Salem. Mrs. Austin, in her novels, which are supposed to be more or less historical, sends doctors on longer journeys than that from Plymouth to Duxbury; by water that journey would be twice as short as by land. However, it must be borne in mind that the graves of the boy and child are not of importance in locating the grave of the Captain from the evidence of his own will.

"The church in Duxbury was formed in 1632." So says Young in his *Chronicles of the Pilgrims*.

The Manuscript Records of Plymouth Church say on page 36: "Those that lived on their lots on the other side of the bay (called Duxburrow,) could no longer bring their wives and children to the public worship and church meetings here (at Plymouth), but with such burthen, as growing to some competent number, they sued to be dismissed and become a body of themselves; and so they were dismissed about this time, (though very unwillingly,) and some time after being united into one entire body, they procured Reverend Mr. Ralph Partrich to be their pastor."

This Ralph Partridge is said to have been "a gracious man of great abilities." He had been a clergyman of the Church of England. It would seem that no church or meeting-house was built in Duxbury until 1637-1638, about the time the people "united into one entire body" and called Rev. Ralph Partridge to be their pastor, at least as early as June, 1637.

The old records also tell us that in 1632, somewhat later than the date of the document signed on "Aprill 2 " by Standish and others, "a number of the brethren inhabiting on the other side of the bay, at a place since called Duxborough, growing weary of attending the worship of God from such distance asked and were granted a dismissal." From this time then the worship of God was carried on in Duxbury, and this would indicate that a settled population was living there, even before that time. Indeed the document of "Aprill 2^d" would show that the Plymouth brethren were shocked to some extent, because the Duxbury brethren, without doubt, had been remiss in attending the public worship in Plymouth in the winter seasons. It is also well to keep in mind that the Aldens claim that the first John Alden house was built in Duxbury in 1627, and they have erected a tablet bearing that date. These dates show that the Duxbury settlement was a permanent one before 1632 when

the plague broke out in Plymouth and that Standish and his family belonged on the Duxbury side.

This last document would seem to indicate that the name of Duxbury had already been adopted by the people of that town. The settlement of Duxbury was undoubtedly made some years before 1632.

Young tells us that Standish removed to Duxbury in 1630.

It must not be lost sight of that as the cattle increased in numbers, and the population increased, it would be more and more difficult for the settlers in Duxbury to go to Plymouth Sabbath after Sabbath. Probably, too, there were not many conveyances, or beasts of burden, to take them there. A journey to Plymouth and back, and attendance on the rather lengthy services would consume most of the day.

Duxbury became a separate town by an order of the General Court on the 7th June, 1637.

4. Speaking of the Captain's will, Mrs. Austin says: "If he had also two sons in the same burial spot would not he have spoken of them as well as of his daughter-in-law? And if the two young women had been buried in such fashion as to leave a space for the father between would not he have alluded to such an arrangement?"

Ans. The plain answer to both these

questions is No. He would not have been so likely to mention the boys who died in youth, as his daughter-in-law, who died only a short time before himself. In his will he plainly refers to the fact that he was to be buried near his daughter and daughter-in-law, in their well-known burial place. He mentioned the place in which he wished to be buried, and in describing that place it was necessary to refer to his daughter and his daughter-in-law but not to the boys. He very evidently took it for granted that his family would know the spot in which he desired to be buried.

5. "These five graves have no dated stones, no parish record, no valid tradition."

Ans. In the Plymouth graveyard the oldest dated stone is for 1681; this will not prove that certain graves of earlier date are not known. We have never heard of graves having a "parish record." There is no "parish record" of any grave in the country.

That these graves have "no valid tradition" is not correct; the strongest possible traditions are attached to these graves in that graveyard. To assume the contrary is a simple begging of the question. In her second letter to the Transcript Mrs. Austin changes her language and says: "My saying that their graves had 'no dated stones' and the deaths no 'parish record,' did not

mean as Mr. H. seems to believe, that in this they differed from other ascertained graves of the same day." Here she changes her language and attributes to me a belief I never held as to her meaning. No grave in the Colony had, or has, a parish record, in the sense of the term "parish record."

6. She says: "I should suppose that any student of our earliest burying-grounds would have learned that burial lots are a modern invention. In the early days the ground belonged to the town, that is to say to the church, for the interests were identical, and persons were buried where the survivors pleased. Burying hill in Plymouth is the oldest and best instance of an ancient New England cemetery, and there one frequently finds the headstone of an alien intruded upon a family group, and 'those who know' assure us that the ground is full of nameless bones above which other bodies have been laid. So the 'burial lot' must be set aside as an anachronism." This is from the letter to the Transcript of June 2, 1891. In her letter to the same paper of July 3, 1891, she says: "As for my statement that the phrase burial lots is an anachronism, as connected with the earliest burying-grounds of our country, I reassert it. A burial place means a place allotted and divided off for the use of a purchaser or donee. This usage did not obtain in our early burying grounds and

although families were naturally laid as near together as convenient, there were no rights of possession given to any individual or family.

Ans. In all this there is nothing to the purpose, because if we granted that families had no special places for burial in the graveyards, and if they were buried one here and one there, still in the case of Captain Standish we know that he was buried near his daughter and daughter-in-law. Mrs. Austin puts a private and strained meaning upon family "burial lot" which no one will admit. The "burial lot" does not in law, or in common language, mean exclusively a lot owned by purchase or by gift. There were places where families were buried by themselves in all the old graveyards. Plymouth Burying Hill is itself a proof of this. Nor was the sanctity of family burial place, burial lot, or burial plot, or whatever you may call it, invaded except in very exceptional cases. The graveyard in Marshfield is proof of this; also the Granary graveyard in Boston, and all the old graveyards in the Colony. The graveyards of England, at the time of which we speak, show that family burial places were respected. Plymouth Burying Hill might be said to be rather a unique burying ground than "the best instance of an ancient New England cemetery."

The people of New England respected,

as English Christians have always done, the sacredness of the family burial place. As a rule families do not intrude on families. Here the graveyards were owned by the town, and the people had permission to bury their dead in certain parts of the graveyard. Fathers desired to be buried with their families, and as the fathers were the voters who controlled all these matters, we may be sure they agreed to respect, as their forefathers had always done, the sacredness of the family burial lots.

7. Mrs. Austin says: "The three-cornerstone theory took its rise in the summer of 1887."

Ans. This is not so. Mrs. Austin then first heard of it; that is all. Mrs. Austin undoubtedly wrote what she believed to be correct when she gave her version of the Prior tradition, but her version so contradicts itself, is so impossible in itself, and so contradicts facts, that there is little hesitation in rejecting it. For instance, she says the grandfather of the last Benjamin Prior was the boy of ten years of age who witnessed the Captain's funeral. The last Benjamin was born in 1775, and the boy who witnessed the funeral was born 1646. These dates would make it highly improbable that it was the grandfather of the last Benjamin Prior who, as a boy of ten years, witnessed the funeral of Captain Standish. The Prior his-

tory contradicts it too; it was the great-grandfather who saw the Standish funeral. This we have already discussed.

CHAPTER XIX

8. The lady who informed Mrs. Austin of Dr. Wadsworth's testimony, given in the presence of Mrs. Ruth Hall, about the two remarkable stones, is said to have stated that she (Mrs. Austin's informant) did not know where Dr. Wadsworth took his guests, whether to Harden Hill or to the old burying ground at Hall's Corner.

Ans. The lady mentioned is not a witness in the case. That she knew nothing of the precise place to which Dr. Wadsworth took his guests is of no value as evidence. The facts remain about the two remarkable pyramidal stones, and that Mrs. Ruth Hall handed down her testimony about them, and that no such stones have been found elsewhere than in the old cemetery, and that all history, and tradition, and evidence from the graves support what we have said.

9. Mrs. Austin confuses the history of the two stones. She gives four different accounts of them. In her letter to the Transcript of June 2nd, she says: "Having heard the story I at once visited the grave, and at the first glance thought such very ordinary looking pieces of stone could not be those described as such unmistakable landmarks. Laying my hand upon one I found it very loose, and easily lifted it out

of the earth, which it penetrated some five or six inches." In her second letter to the Transcript of July 3d, she says: "The origin of this theory was that when the three-cornered stones (one of which, by the way, is four-sided)." In her letter to the Old Colony Memorial she calls them "two little triangular stones," marking the grave, as she thinks, of "Alexander Standish," who died in 1703, or Josias Standish. In her "Standish of Standish" page 419, she says that the grave of Captain Standish lay across the valley from the Captain's Hill, and is "marked head and foot with a great three-cornered stone."

Thus we see she calls them "two ordinary looking pieces of stone," "two little triangular stones," "two great three-cornered stones," and finally says that one of them is a "four-sided stone." Then she puts them, (1) at Captain Standish's grave, (2) at Alexander's grave, and (3) at the grave of Josias Standish. Alexander died in 1702, and at one time she makes the Prior boy see his funeral, and another time the Captain's in 1656, at another time that of Josias who moved to Connecticut and was buried there. Again she makes the boy, the same boy, ten years of age in 1656, and the same age in 1702, and the same age at the funeral of Josias, who was not buried in Duxbury at all.

Speaking of the stones she says she moved the eastern one, "easily lifting" it out of the ground which it penetrated but five or six inches. Mr. Melzar Brewster, who was employed by the Rural Society to put the old graveyard in order, distinctly told me that the stones were in the same position from the time he discovered them, before 1887, until May, 1891. It was between these two dates that Mrs. Austin inspected the stones and "easily lifted" one of them.

The weather marks on the stones, and the moss lines, etc., plainly showed how deep the stones were in the earth. The stone at the eastern end, or foot of the grave, measures two feet seven in direct altitude, and weighs seventy-nine pounds. Seventeen inches of its altitude were in the earth, and from the shape of the stone it would be impossible for the strongest man in Duxbury to easily lift the stone even with his two hands. The stone was in that position, Mr. Brewster says, before 1887, when Mrs. Austin first saw it. The stones were not removed at any time by those digging there. The diggers of 1889 have told me so, and in 1891 they were not removed when we were opening the graves. The lateral altitudes of the faces of the stone at the foot of the grave and above the ground, were 17, 15, and $13\frac{1}{2}$ inches. The bases of the triangular faces were 9, 9, and $7\frac{1}{2}$ inches. These

measurements were made before the stone was removed from the position it occupied when Mrs. Austin saw it. Later it was removed to be weighed, more fully measured, and photographed.

The other stone at the head of the grave weighs one hundred and nine pounds, and is thirty inches in direct altitude. It was buried in the ground to a depth of nearly eighteen inches. The lateral altitudes of the triangular faces above the ground, were $12\frac{1}{2}$, 13, and $11\frac{1}{2}$ inches; the bases of the same faces measured 8, $6\frac{1}{2}$ and 11 inches. These measurements were taken, some of them, before the stone was removed, and some after it had been taken up to be photographed and weighed.

All those who have seen the stones admit that for all purposes of description in a general letter on the evidence the stones would be rightly called "triangular pyramids." Mrs. Austin herself having seen the stones so described them in her "Standish of Standish," and in her letters to the Old Colony Memorial of Plymouth, and to the Transcript. That she afterwards called one of them a "four-sided one" may be accounted for by the fact that one of the edges of this seventy-nine pound stone, which she easily lifted, was broken off, or sliced off. This edge is thicker than the other edges, and you can see at once that it was sliced off for about

eight or ten inches of its length, as the edge still remains on the lower part of the stone. What Mrs. Austin at one time calls a fourth side would be more aptly described as a thick edge. Those who are interested can see the stones for themselves.

10. Mrs. Austin admits that the arguments drawn from the public highways of the early town to locate the church are good from 1650. Standish was buried in 1656. Therefore, even she should admit the possibility that he was buried at Hall's Corner graveyard. If the arguments from the roads, etc., are good from 1650, they ought to be good from 1637 when the roads were surveyed, especially as they were the only roads for a great many years, in fact until after 1700.

11. She says of the town or parish records that "all such records previous to 1665 were destroyed by fire."

The statement made by Mrs. Austin and others, that the town records were destroyed by fire in 1665, and therefore we have no official record of events before that time, is altogether erroneous. The only destruction of any records of Duxbury of which we positively know took place in 1682-3. There is a record for the 26th March, 1682-3, mentioning that the town clerk's house had been burnt and ordering the re-entry on the records of land of Henry Sampson, which

record had been destroyed. This record will be found in Book A, p. 232. This is the only record in existence of the destruction of any of the records of Duxbury, for a period covering at least 100 years from the founding of the town. The vague tradition to which Mrs. Austin and others appeal about a fire in 1665 is without foundation. It is fully evident from the order to re-enter the record of Henry Sampson's land that this was about the only serious record lost. If others had been lost there would have been an order for their re-entry on the town's records. Besides, this record of the fire is given at page 232 in Book A of the records, and it is plain, as I have said, that if all the records had been destroyed, all entries prior to 1682 would have been lost. But this is not so.

Besides, many of the records of the town are to be found in the Old Colony Records, and in the records of other towns at one time part of Duxbury.

12. She says that the most important of the first settlers, with the exception of John Alden, settled in the Nook beside Captain Standish, and therefore the first church was built, not at Hall's Corner, but at Harden Hill for the sake of convenience.

Ans. Anyone who examines the ground will at once see that a church on Harden Hill would be far more inaccessible and inconvenient for Standish and all his sup-

posed neighbors than one at Hall's Corner. Again, the most important of the first settlers did not all, Alden excepted, live in the Nook and near the Captain. The most important of the settlers, after Standish and Brewster, were Stephen Tracy, Jonathan Brewster, Thomas Prince, Christopher Wadsworth, William Basset, Francis Sprague, the Howlands, Southworths, Browns, Bumpuses, Soules, Delanos, Pollards, Hilliers and others. These men lived on towards Kingston, along the eastern shore towards Powder Point, and around the mill at Mill Brook, and towards Duck Hill in Marshfield. The notion, then, that the church was near Standish for the accommodation of himself and the chief settlers of the town is without foundation in fact. Every such argument would point to the place between Hall's and Bayley's Corners.

13. Elder Brewster "was their minister" for some years, "though never ordained."

Ans. Elder Brewster was never the minister of the church in Duxbury, and never was called such by any historian. He was not even minister in Plymouth during the years when they had no minister. The most ever said of him in this matter is that he conducted service and preached when they had no settled minister. There is no proof that he was ever connected with the Duxbury church.

Elder Brewster was the ruling Elder of the Plymouth church to the day of his death. Bradford says he was eighty years of age at his death; others say he was eighty-four.

The first minister of Duxbury, mentioned as such by all historians, including Mr. Justin Winsor, was the Rev. Ralph Partridge, who came to Duxbury in 1637, and, according to Mather's *Magnalia*, died in 1658.

The second minister was Rev. John Holmes from 1658 to 1675.

The third was Rev. Ichabod Wiswall from 1676 to 1700. Mr. Wiswall's tombstone still stands in the little cemetery at Hall's Corner, not far from Standish's grave.

The fourth was Rev. John Robinson who succeeded Mr. Wiswall.

14. "A little house, probably no more than a cabin, was built for purposes of worship, and surely this would be in the vicinity of the Captain's and Elder's homes."

"The first church in Plymouth was built in 1648 and was replaced by another in 1683, a period of thirty-five years, and probably the first church edifice in the little settlement gathered about Captain's Hill was even shorter lived."

"'Constant tradition' places this church on Harden Hill just north of the Brewster farm, and I am inclined to consider this tradition as very likely to be an historical fact."

Ans. Let us examine this statement,

paragraph by paragraph. As to the first paragraph. There are three guesses in it, but not a bit of evidence, or real tradition or history. The first guess is that a little house was built for worship. The second guess, that it was probably no more than a cabin. And the third guess that it "surely would be in the vicinity of the Captain's and Elder's homes." Very good, let us grant the guesses and ask—When was this little house built? Where precisely was it built? Mrs. Austin thinks it was certainly in the vicinity of Captain Standish's and Elder Brewster's homes. But the Hall's Corner site was far nearer by road than Harden Hill, for you came up to the gates of "the Noock" and immediately you were on the road from "Morton's Hole to Ducksburrow towne," as the record of 1637 says; this road led not to Harden Hill, but to Duck Hill in Marshfield and to Green Harbor. Why the Elder and the Captain should be specially favored in the location of the church I do not see. It is true the church was fairly near to them, but it was far nearer to several of the other settlers. I feel certain that the site of the church was selected, not with a view to pleasing any one person, or two, but with an eye single to the welfare of the whole community and to a possible union with Plymouth in the future. Besides, there was no road to Harden Hill.

The second paragraph, referring to the meeting-house built in Plymouth in 1648, is altogether beside the question. Duxbury was not an active imitator of Plymouth, reproducing Plymouth things in smaller ways and for shorter periods. The records show that the first church in Duxbury stood from 1638 to 1706-7, a period of sixty-nine years, and Justin Winsor and all other authorities on Duxbury History state that the first church stood for "sixty" or "seventy" years, and these writers, including Mr. Winsor, evidently based their statements on tradition, not on documents. I base my argument on documents; if it were a question of mere tradition, I could not waste time upon it.

Mrs. Austin's statement that the first church in Plymouth was built in 1648, is not supported by the most eminent authorities on Plymouth history. Mr. William T. Davis of Plymouth, in his "Ancient Landmarks of Plymouth," says that the little fortress erected on Burial Hill (at that time Fort Hill) in 1622, served as a church or meeting-house until 1637, when the Plymouth people built their first meeting-house on a site now covered by the tower of the Odd Fellows' Hall and the store of Hatch and Shaw.

It will be seen, then, the Duxbury Church, mentioned in the records in 1638, was built at about the same period as the Plymouth church of 1637.

Mrs. Austin's third conjecture, placing the first meeting-house on Harden Hill, fast hardens into almost a fact for her; this theory we have already refuted.

Mrs. Austin, when reminded that in her "Standish of Standish" she buried Myles in the old graveyard near Hall's Corner, said she buried him there as a "picturesque possibility." In all this Mrs. Austin begs all her positions and proves nothing. No comment is necessary other than her own words in the Transcript of June 2, 1891: "One great stumbling block in the path of historical research is the proneness of the human mind to believe what it wants to believe, and to accept as proven that which is only tradition or fancy."

15. The graves of the early settlers were likely to be hidden "especially after the beginning of the Pequot war."

Ans. Even if the graves were hidden, the men who buried Standish would know where they had buried him, and his daughter's grave was known, as we see from the Captain's will. What connection was there between Standish's grave and the Pequot war which was ended nineteen years before the Captain died?

16. She says the conditions for the franchise in Duxbury were never enforced in the case of Standish.

Ans. She says this in speaking of Stan-

dish's religion, a matter of irrelevance from her standpoint. I felt obliged to speak of his religion, because some said that he was a Roman Catholic, and therefore not buried with the Pilgrims. In the assumption she makes she would have Standish, one of the founders of the town, demanding from others conditions for the freedom of the town, which he would not and did not demand from himself. Standish on this point was ruled by the townsmen, and they were not in the habit of making laws simply to set them aside.

17. Mrs. Austin, speaking of the old burying-ground at Hall's Corner, calls it the "Second Burying Ground," using capital letters, so as to insinuate to outsiders that it was known by that name. Again she says: "Now if in 1675 the Second Burying Ground was a new one as the Duxbury argument claims"

Ans. As I am the one responsible for the "Duxbury Argument," I most emphatically say that our argument always contended, and contends, that the old cemetery near Hall's Corner, called by Mrs. Austin the "Second Burying Ground" was the first burying ground, and is known in Duxbury and the records of Duxbury as the old cemetery, not as the "Second Burying Ground."

18. Mrs. Austin cites some authorities in her letters to sustain her views. Those of them who can must answer for them-

selves. As to me no man's authority, as merely his, is of any use in matters of history.

The only things of weight in history are evidence and applied common sense. The location of the grave of Myles Standish is a matter of historic research. We have tried to follow out the lines of historic evidence. The public will be judge.

It seems unnecessary to say more, but Mrs. Austin in her "Betty Alden" has thought it right to say about the burial place of Standish:—

"In the absence of all proof in any such matter, tradition becomes important, and so far as I have been able to determine, the tradition that some of the earliest settlers were buried in the vicinity of a temporary meeting-house upon Harden Hill in Duxbury is more reliable than the tradition that Standish was laid in an old burying-ground at Hall's Corner, which, probably, was not set aside as a burial place in 1656, the date of his death. That of Elder Brewster, concerning whose burial we have many particulars, is altogether unknown, except that it seems to have been upon Burying Hill. Perhaps that of Standish is there also, for when he says, 'If I die in Duxbury I should like', etc., he may mean that if he dies in Duxbury he would fain be carried to Plymouth there to lie beside his daughters and his two little sons as well."

In this attempt at an historical novel Mrs. Austin assumes all her history, and even contradicts herself, and misquotes historical documents. She assumes a meeting house on Harden Hill; she assumes that Standish was buried there; she assumes as likely that Brewster was buried in Plymouth; she says perhaps Standish is buried in Plymouth; she assumes that his daughters are buried in Plymouth, and his two young sons. All these things she assumes as probable, or at least as possible. In her "Standish of Standish" she buries the Captain in Hall's Corner graveyard. She misquotes the Captain's will which reads: "And if I die att Duxborrow my body to be layed as neare as conveniently may bee to my two dear daughters, Lora Standish my daughter and Mary Standish my daughter-in-law." This plainly tells whether his daughters were buried in Plymouth or not. The record of Nathaniel Morton (40 years secretary of the Colony), cited in one of the earlier chapters, states that Standish died in Duxburrow and was honorably buried in that town. Let the public judge of the value of Mrs. Austin's history.

Mrs. Austin knew nothing whatever about the second boy until I brought the matter to light; neither did anyone else.

It hardly seems out of place to say that John Alden is undoubtedly buried in the

same graveyard where Myles Standish lies. John Alden in his old age lived and died in the home of his son Jonathan. This son died in 1697, and his tombstone is the most perfect, as well as the oldest dated one of all the tombstones in the old cemetery. Jonathan was without doubt buried beside his wife Abigail, who died August 17, 1725, and whose tombstone still stands in the old burying ground. The stone that marked Jonathan's grave was kept in one of the private houses in Duxbury; I think it has been returned to the cemetery. Now it seems almost certain that Jonathan Alden was buried near his father, who died according to some in September, 1686, according to others in September, 1687, and at the most only ten or eleven years before Jonathan died. John Alden, his wife Priscilla, and almost all the old settlers of the town lie buried in the old cemetery between Hall's and Bayley's Corners. This seems certain.

As to Major Alden's feeling or belief that John Alden was buried a little to the west of the Methodist Episcopal Church (now the Protestant Episcopal), in Duxbury, we make two remarks: first, John Alden is buried in a cemetery that is west of the said church, for the old cemetery where Standish lies is west (or west by south), and, secondly, the second John Alden was accused of witchcraft, and it is possible that he, or

some succeeding John, was buried near where the Protestant Episcopal church now stands. This, of course, is irrelevant to our argument. The land around the Protestant Episcopal church never belonged to the Aldens, and never was used as a cemetery in the seventeenth century. It is not likely that John Alden was buried on another man's land.

CHAPTER XX

We can account for the burial of some of the first settlers elsewhere than in Duxbury, as, for example, Mrs. Barbara Standish, the Captain's second wife, and Jonathan Brewster. It was commonly said that Mrs. Standish went to Connecticut with her son Josias, and is buried there.

As to Elder and Mrs. Brewster, she is buried in Plymouth, and it is likely the Elder also is buried there.

The Rev. John Robinson in a letter to Elder Brewster on the 20th December, 1623, speaks of Mrs. Brewster's very delicate health, and hopes that the arrival of her daughters, Fear and Patience, may be a relief to her; from the letter we know that Mrs. Brewster had been in ill health for some time before the Pilgrims left Leyden. In Bradford's list of Mayflower passengers Mrs. (Mary) Brewster is mentioned. Bradford again speaks of her in the list of survivors and their descendants in the year 1651. Bradford there says: "M^r. Brewster lived to very old age; about 80. years he was when he dyed, having lived some 23. or 24. years here in y^e countrie; & though his wife dyed long before, yet she dyed aged." Governor Bradford says that Elder Brewster died on the

16th April, 1644. The figure six in sixteen seems to have been subjected to an attempt to change it to ten, so that the manuscript would read the tenth, but the figure six was so changed as to make it almost appear like the figure eight, and so we find that Morton in his Memorial places Elder Brewster's death on the 18th (eighteenth) of April, and in the year 1644. Bradford in his list of 1651, says the Elder had been 23 or 24 years in this country when he died. This evidently means that he was over twenty-three years, but not quite twenty-four. He was here twenty-three years in December, 1643, and he would have been twenty-four years in December, 1644, but he died in April, 1644.

But the question of the date of Brewster's death seems to be decided by the entries in the book known as "The Brewster Book." There was a manuscript copy of this found in the Boston Public Library in 1896, and investigation brought to light that the original was owned by Mr. Cordilla Walker Fitch of Morrisville, Vermont. The manuscript is said to have been in the possession of the Elder himself, and if none of the entries are in his writing, certainly some of them were entered by Jonathan Brewster. Among the entries by Jonathan Brewster is this:—

"Mary Brewster the wife of William

Brewster dyed at Plymouth in New England, the 17th of Aprill, 1627."

and also this about the Elder:—

"William Brewster dyed at Plymouth in New England the 10th of Aprill, 1644."

Mrs. Brewster's name is not given in the list of the 22nd May, 1627, although the wives (if living) of other participants in the cattle allotment are given. Elder Brewster is at the head of Lot No. 5. It would seem, then, that she was dead before the allotment of cattle took place, and Jonathan Brewster's diary says she died 17th April, 1627, at Plymouth. Very likely, then, she was buried in Plymouth, and it is very probable, though not so certain, that Elder Brewster also was buried in Plymouth. The Brewster Diary, or Book, says the Elder also died in Plymouth. We do know that the Elder's home was in Duxbury for several years. We are not told that he returned to Plymouth to live there. He may have been visiting at the home of some of his relatives, or friends, when he died; or, indeed, he may have gone to Plymouth for the Sabbath Services, as the 10th April, 1644, was on a Sabbath or Sunday. It would seem likely, then, that the Elder was buried in Plymouth, but we have not the same certainty for it that we have for Standish's burial in Duxbury.

Mrs. Austin would argue that because

Brewster was buried in Plymouth, therefore Standish was buried there, even in the face of the evidence of Standish's will, and the evidence of Nathaniel Morton, the Secretary of the Colony. Of course, in 1891, 1892, Mrs. Austin knew nothing of the "Brewster" Diary, or Book, and neither did I. My argument at that time was based on the facts known at the time. I knew that Brewster removed from Plymouth to Duxbury, and there was not a bit of evidence known to me, or available by me, that he had died in Plymouth. The Jonathan Brewster entries have changed all this. The fact that Love and Jonathan Brewster, and Captain Standish, and Edward Winslow, and Thomas Prince, and Governor Bradford, are mentioned as "returning" to the Governor's house after the funeral would not prove anything for or against Plymouth, or Duxbury, as the burial place of the Elder. The gentlemen who went to the Governor's house were all interested in the settlement of the Brewster estate, and Captain Standish and Edward Winslow and Thomas Prince and Governor Bradford were the men who made the award in the distribution of the Elder's property between Jonathan and Love Brewster, (the only surviving sons mentioned in the Old Colony Records), in August, 1645. Besides, the Governor had a home at Kingston and he may have been there in April, 1644, even as

early as the 10th of the month, to arrange for planting his spring crops, and the gentlemen named might have returned with him to Kingston.

While searching in the old graveyard near Hall's Corner I discovered a grave which had been paved with ordinary stones. The stones around the borders of the surface of the grave were placed on edge, and the inner portion paved with large and small stones. The grave had sunk so that the stones once on the surface were several inches under ground, and the roots of a cherry tree, long since cut down, had reached out ten or twelve feet and interlarded themselves with the stones. The roots were large. All indications show that the grave is a very old one. It lies between the Standish graves and the foundation of the first church. In so far as I can learn the grave is unique in the old graveyards of Plymouth Colony.

Everything being taken into account it is easily seen that the grave is that of one of the most prominent of the early settlers of the town, and it may possibly be that of Elder Brewster, or more likely of the Rev. Ralph Partridge, the first minister, who died in 1658.

CHAPTER XXI

It is obvious that Captain Standish's will has a great bearing on our subject.

STANDISH'S WILL

"The last will and testament of Capt. Myles Standish Gent. exhibited before the court held at Plymouth, the 4th of May 1657, on the oath of Capt. James Cudworth and ordered to bee registered as followeth:

"Given under my hand this March the 7th 1655. Witnesseth these Presents that I Myles Standish Senr. of Duxburrow being in pfect memory yett deseased in my body, and knowing the fraile estate of man in his best estate I do make this to bee my last will and testament in manner and form following.

"1. My will is that out of my whole estate my funerall charges to bee taken out & my body to bee buried in decent maner and if I die att Duxburrow my body to be layed as neare as conveniently may bee to my two dear Daughters Lora Standish my Daughter and Mary Standish my daughter in law.

"2. My will is that out of the remaining pte of my whole estate that all my just and lawful debts which I now owe or at the day of my death may owe bee paid.

"3. Out of what remains according to the order of this Gov^rment: my will is that my dear and loveing wife Barbara Standish shall have the third pte.

"4. I have given to my son Josias Standish upon his marriage one young horse five sheep and two heffors which I must upon that contract of marriage make forty pounds yett not knowing whether the estate will bear it att present; my will is that the resedue remaine in the whole stocke and that every one of my four sons viz Allexander Standish Myles Standish Josias Standish and Charles Standish may have forty pounds appeec if not that they may have proportionable to ye remaining pte bee it more or less.

"5. My will is that my eldest son Allexander shall have a double share in land.

"6. My will is that soe long as they live single that the whole bee in ptenership betwixt them.

"7. I doe ordaine and make my dearly beloved wife Barbara Standish Allexander Standish Myles Standish and Josias Standish joint Executors of this my last will & testament.

"8. I doe by this my will make and appoint my loveing frinds Mr. Timothy Hatherley and Cap^t. James Cudworth supervissors of this my last will and that they wil be pleased to doe the office of christian

love to be healpfull to my poor wife and children by their christian counsell and advise and if any difference should arise which I hope will not, my will is that my said supervissors shall determine the same, and that they see that my poor wife shall have as comfortable maintainance as my poor state will beare the whole time of her life which if you my loveing frinds please to doe though neither they nor I shall be able to recompenc, I doe not doubt but the Lord will;

"By me Myles Standish further my will is that Marcye Robinson whom I tenderly love for her Grandfathers sake shall have three pounds in something to goe forward for her two years after my decease which my will is my overseers shall see performed.

"Further my will is that my servant John Irish Jun^r have forty shillings more than his covenant which will appeer upon the Towne Book alwaies provided that he continew till the time he covenanted bee expired in the service of my Executors or of any of them with their joint concert.

By me

March 7 1655

MYLES STANDISH.

"9. I give unto my son & heire aparent Allexander Standish all my lands as heire apparrent by lawfull decent in Ormstick Borsconge Wrightington Maudsley Newburrow Crawston and in the Isle of Man

and given to mee as right heire by lawful decent but surruptuously detained from me my great Grandfather being a 2cond or younger brother from the house of Standish of Standish.

March 7 1655.

By mee

MYLES STANDISH.

Witnessed by mee—James Cudworth."

Plymouth Colony Records, Book of Wills, vol. 2d, pages 37, 38.

It may be remarked that Captain James Cudworth of Scituate was alive in 1667.

There was a Captain James Cudworth in the war of 1675 against King Philip; was this the same Captain Cudworth? Or was this second Captain the son of the first? Marcy Robinson mentioned in the will was the daughter of Isaac, son of Rev. John Robinson of Leyden. She was born 4th July, 1647, and received baptism from Rev. Mr. Lothrop of Barnstable.

CHAPTER XXII

STANDISH'S RELIGION

It was brought out during the discussions about the location of Standish's grave, that some people held that Standish was not buried in the cemetery of the Pilgrims because he was a Roman Catholic. This certainly was a strange objection.

At least one eulogist of the Pilgrims, speaking of their tolerance, said that the kindness shown to Standish was a proof of their broad-mindedness, for that Standish was a Roman Catholic. Where did these people get this idea about Standish's religion? My impression is that the idea arose from the investigations made in the nineteenth century about the property mentioned in Standish's will as having been "surrupuously" kept from him. When the investigators in the first half of the nineteenth century discovered that the Standishes of Standish were Roman Catholics in the Captain's time, they concluded that he too was a Roman Catholic.

The persons making the objection about his burial place very evidently knew nothing of the Captain's will, and his desire to be

buried with Lora and Mary Standish. There never was the least evidence, there is not now, and I feel that there never can be any, to show that Standish was a Roman Catholic during his life with the Pilgrims, or at his death. He may have sprung from a family that was Roman Catholic, but that will prove nothing as to his own beliefs when he grew up. I am, directly, only concerned about the Captain's grave. That question is altogether apart from his religion. He asked to be buried with his children. He was "honorably" buried with them. His grave was pointed out by tradition. The history of the town proves our contention about the graves. Still, I think a few words not inopportune on his religious views.

The compact of the Mayflower was signed by Standish. This compact reads: "We whose names are underwritten, have undertaken for the glory of God and advancement of the christian faith and the honor of our king and country, a voyage to plant the first colony in northern Virginia," etc. At that time, so far as the Pilgrims knew, Plymouth was within the limits of northern Virginia. It was "in November 1620, while the Mayflower was on her passage that by new letters patent the northern company was changed to the President and Council of New England, or the Plymouth Company."

Can anyone believe that Standish would have come to advance the Christian religion, according to the ideas of the Pilgrims, if he had been a Roman Catholic?

Edward Winslow and others say that Standish came under the influence of the Rev. John Robinson and his congregation in Leyden before the Pilgrims came here, and, of course, it is evident that he did.

In 1632 he signed the promise to remove his family to Plymouth in the winter time, that they might the better repair to the worship of God. His children were brought up in the Pilgrim church. The Pilgrims were most avowedly opposed to the Roman Church. The religious atmosphere of the Pilgrims would not have been congenial to Standish, had he been a Roman Catholic. He never could have any of the religious offices of his own church during his life with them. The Pilgrims came, that among their blessings and their hardships they might have liberty of conscience.

It is well to keep in mind that the history of Duxbury shows that church membership was a "necessary qualification" for a freeman of the town until 1664; this was eight years after Standish's death. By degrees the people became more tolerant. There were Quakers in town in 1660, for there is a record showing that some Quakers were fined that year. Others may have had their own religious

beliefs, not all of these agreeing with the beliefs of the general body of townsmen. The qualification of church membership for the freemen was entirely abrogated in 1686. I would refer to Mr. Winsor's History of Duxbury on this point.

Standish's name is entered in 1646 as a freeman of Duxbury. He was an officer of the Colony for many years. His position as military leader of the colonists would prove that his lot was all in all with the Pilgrims. Living and worshipping with them, fighting for them and risking his life for their welfare, his children and theirs intermarrying, would he have refused to be buried with them? Would he prefer burial on his farm, or some other's farm, or on the common lands, rather than in the cemetery with the loved friends and trusted companions of his life? He could not be buried in what Roman Catholics call "consecrated ground," for according to their views there was no one to consecrate it.

In 1643 the towns of Plymouth, Duxbury, and Marshfield, formed a military company with Standish as Captain. The fourteenth article of the constitution of this company was: "That no one be admitted except he takes the oath of fidelity." This meant fidelity to the Colony. The thirteenth article reads, that upon the death of any member "the company upon warning shall come together with their arms and inter his corpse

as a soldier and according to his place and quality." Can anyone conceive that a Roman Catholic would have taken the oath of a freeman, and the oath of loyalty of this military company? The whole genius of the Pilgrim movement was religiously and politically at variance with the Roman Church. Who believes that Standish would have required from the members of the military company an oath which he would not be willing to take himself? We may be certain this military company attended his funeral.

Among the Captain's books, the list of which was made by his widow, were the following:—

Three old Bibles.

One Testament.

One Psalm Book.

Calvin's Institutions.

Preston's Sermons.

Burrough's Christian Contentment.

Gospel Conversation.

Passions of the Mind.

Burrough's Earthly Mindedness.

Ball on Faith.

Dodd on the Lord's Supper.

Sparks against Heresy.

Davenport's Apology.

A Reply to Dr. Cotton on Baptism.

Nature and Grace in Conflict.

Commentary on James Ball's Catechism.

Burrough's Discovery.

Brinsley's Watch.

Dr. Hales' Works.

and several books on medicine, law, artillery, history, and literature, including Homer, Caesar, etc., etc.

Not a single Roman Catholic book among them all!

Standish was unquestionably a man of strong passions. It may be that he never fully joined any church as a communicant at the Lord's Table, for we all know men, devout men, who are members of our churches, but who do not feel themselves, for some reason, drawn to the Lord's Supper. Standish having to fight men, to kill men, as he did at Wessagusset and elsewhere, like many another soldier, may have felt that his profession ought to exclude him from some of the more intimate and sacred privileges of church members. Indeed, it may be that, although heartily in sympathy with the Pilgrims in their religious beliefs, and business and political aims, he was not in full accord on all points of doctrine, but there is no proof of this—none at all. He was a Protestant, that is more than clear. He, as a magistrate, married people, and as a Roman Catholic he could not have done so, for the Roman Church says marriage is a Sacrament, and only the duly ordained clergy of the Roman Church can administer Roman Sacraments. Perhaps some one may say, the Roman

Church allows a layman to confer Baptism, etc., in case of necessity, and therefore even as a Roman Catholic, Standish might have officiated at marriages. I answer,—Certainly not, for there was no necessity that he should officiate, and especially for Protestants, as there were many men of their own belief capable of officiating for them.

In my opinion it is not at all unlikely that others of the Leyden congregation of the Rev. John Robinson may have been born of Roman Catholic parents, and that some such may have been among both Pilgrims and Puritans. We have no such means of knowing about them as we have of knowing about Standish. It was an age of changes in religious beliefs.

The objection that because Standish was not elected or appointed one of the Commissioners of the Plymouth Colony to act with the Commissioners from the other three New England Colonies in 1643, therefore he was a Roman Catholic, or at least not a member of the church in Plymouth, or Duxbury, is as puerile an objection as could be offered. Standish was especially engaged and busy in his work as the military leader of the Plymouth Colony, and it was not likely that he would be elected, or chosen, as a Commissioner from Plymouth, when his absence at the meetings of the Commissioners might be a serious detriment to the colonists.

The four Colonies represented were Connecticut, New Haven, Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay.

In fine, he asked to be buried with his children, who were Protestants.

CHAPTER XXIII

It may be of interest to give a few extracts from letters received by the writer.

The Hon. Charles T. Davis of Plymouth, Mass., wrote to me on the 30th September, 1892:—

“E. J. V. Huiginn,
Dear Sir:—

I cannot resist the temptation to thank you for the close, logical and conclusive argument you were kind enough to send me concerning the location of Standish's grave. I fear that you mistook one calling at least. Your argument is unanswerable, and must set at rest all doubts concerning his resting place.

I am sorry my friend, Mrs. Austin, ventured to suggest such paltry, cavilling and ignorant doubts upon the subject. . . .

Yrs very truly,

CHAS. T. DAVIS.”

From Myles Standish, Esq., New York.

“The Century

7 West Forty-third St.,

New York, May 30th, 1891.

My Dear Sir:—

I have read with great pleasure and interest your letter to the Boston Herald relative to the ‘Grave of Myles Standish.’

There is no doubt in my mind as to the

correctness of your conclusions, and I regard the question of the location of the grave of Standish as permanently settled. . . .

Very truly yours,

M. STANDISH."

Again on the 5th December, 1892, the same Mr. Standish says that the evidence "convinced me of the identity of the bodies discovered."

Mr. Standish sent me yet another letter:

"Paris, Jan. 8th, 1893.

Rev. E. J. V. Huiginn,

My Dear Sir:—

Thanks for your letter and pamphlet which were duly received. The letter I have read with much care, and must congratulate you upon the very clear and conclusive presentation of all the evidence, documentary and traditional, in the matter. The objections to your conclusions are trivial, and not based upon any special study of the subject.

Certainly the objections of the author of 'Standish of Standish' are not worth the notice you have given them.

Yours very truly,

M. STANDISH."

Captain Edward Baker, of North Duxbury, a former officer in the United States Navy, and a descendant of old Pilgrim families, wrote to me on the 27th Sept., 1893:—

"I was impressed beyond expression by

your successful research, and instead of my impression fading it continually grows stronger, and having proved beyond a reasonable doubt where lies the body of Standish, with the durable memorial you memorize yourself as well as him."

Captain Baker had already written me on the 8th September, 1892, when speaking of the Pilgrims and their relation to the founding of this Republic, he said:—

"What more interesting feature concerning its origin is before the World (I say world, 'tis not simply a Duxbury interest,) than memorializing and marking the resting place of this magnificent man, who died, as it were, at the nation's birth in the wilderness—soon to 'blossom like the rose.' "

Letter from Miss Lucia A. Bradford dated Duxbury, May 28th, 1892.

"Dear Mr. Huiginn,

I thank you for starting the fund for a monument to Myles Standish, and I wish to be a contributor to it to the amount of twenty-five dollars.

Yours with much regard,

L. A. BRADFORD."

Mr. Ariel Standish Thurston of Elmira, N.Y., wrote:—

"Dec. 17, '92.


"Dear Sir:—

I have read the pamphlet you were so kind as to send me, and I am of opinion that

you have proved very satisfactorily that the graves of Standish and his daughters have been found."

I have received letters in a similar strain from "people from everywhere" as I might say.





STANDISH BURIAL PLACE AS IT NOW LOOKS

CHAPTER XXIV

The list of contributors to the expense of placing the boulders and guns at the burial place of Standish and his children, contains many prominent descendants of the Captain, who were thoroughly satisfied with the proofs submitted that Standish's burial place was at last known.

When the evidence had all been published and duly weighed, it was the unanimous feeling of a meeting of the citizens of Duxbury and others interested, held in August, 1892, that some permanent memorial should be placed to mark the Standish burial place. Accordingly the following committee was elected to place a suitable memorial in the cemetery and to raise funds to meet the expense:—

Captain Edward Baker, North Duxbury; Walter J. Graves, Duxbury (now Dr. Walter J. Graves, of Dorchester); E. J. V. Huiginn, Duxbury; John H. Parks, Island Creek, Duxbury; George Lloyd Winsor, Duxbury, and William J. Wright, Duxbury.

These gentlemen had the present memorial placed at the graves. The Navy Department of Washington gave us the guns and empty shell. Mr. Graves acted as Treasurer of the Committee. I think it proper to include his report.

210 THE GRAVES OF MYLES STANDISH

TREASURER'S REPORT OF

List of Subscribers to mark the Graves of
Myles Standish, Lora Standish, and
Mary Standish.

George L. Winsor.....	\$5.00
Charles L. Gaines.....	1.00
James Myles Standish.....	10.00
Mrs. Russell Sage (New York)	10.00
Collected by J. M. Standish.....	4.00
Walter J. Graves.....	11.00
Miss Lucia A. Bradford.....	25.00
Mrs. A. Tileston.....	1.00
Mr. and Mrs. F. B. Knapp.....	5.00
A. E. Green.....	2.00
Miss Abbie Turner.....	1.00
W. T. Gross.....	5.00
Per Miss Ellen L. Sampson.....	17.00
William J. Wright.....	32.45
John H. Parks.....	30.00
Myles Standish (New York).....	30.00
J. H. Stickney (Baltimore).....	10.00
William A. Rust.....	10.00
Charles A. Vialle.....	5.00
O. H. Dana.....	10.00
J. W. Wood.....	2.00
Nelson Stockwell.....	1.00
A. S. Waterman.....	1.00
E. Alden.....	1.00
F. W. Hatch.....	1.00
Elisha Peterson.....	.50
George H. Stearns.....	1.00
W. J. Burgess.....	1.00

Marsh & Gardner.....	5.00
L. B. Sherman.....	1.00
Thomas Lockwood.....	5.00
Miss E. W. Sears.....	1.00
Dr. Myles Standish.....	25.00
Captain George C. Cushman.....	10.00
Henry F. Coe.....	5.00
Hon. Elijah A. Morse, M.C.....	25.00
Hon. Ariel Standish Thurston, (Elmira, N.Y.).....	5.00
Martin Brimmer.....	10.00
J. Montgomery Sears.....	10.00
Mrs. L. M. Cobb.....	.25
M. P. Standish.....	5.00
"Hingham".....	1.10
Thomas Alden.....	1.00
S. S. Boylston.....	.50
George E. Baker.....	1.00
George E. Belknap.....	1.00
Charles Boylston.....	.50
J. D. Randall.....	1.00
Edward Baker.....	1.00
Walter W. Estes.....	.50
E. C. Estes.....	.50
Dr. S. Henry.....	1.00
George M. Baker.....	1.00
E. H. Chandler.....	1.00
George Bradford.....	1.00
"Cash".....	1.00
E. J. V. Huiginn.....	10.00
E. J. Sweetser.....	1.00
Total.....	<u>\$364.30</u>

212 THE GRAVES OF MYLES STANDISH

EXPENDITURES

Treasurer. Postal cards soliciting subscriptions.....	\$0.85
P. O'Riordan, hauling guns, etc., from Navy Yard.....	25.00
Old Colony R.R. Co. Freight on guns, etc.....	6.00
H. Peterson, hauling guns to ceme- tery.....	22.00
D. W. Bowker, hauling and marking boulders.....	74.80
H. Peterson, hauling small boulders to cemetery.....	4.00
H. B. Chandler, work on wall, placing guns, etc.....	225.00
Chains.....	3.00
Freight on twelve shell	3.00
Telephoning and postage.....	.65
Total.....	<hr/> \$364.30

WALTER J. GRAVES,

Dec. 4th, 1893.

Treasurer of Committee.

It was through the kind offices of the Hon. Elijah A. Morse, M.C., Canton, Mass., that the Navy Department of the United States gave us the use of some guns to set in place at the burial place of Standish. The following letters are self-explanatory.

“Bureau of Ordnance,
Navy Department

Washington, Sept. 26, 1892.

Hon. Elijah A. Morse,
Canton, Mass.

Sir:—

Referring to your letter of the 14th inst:—

The Bureau has directed the Boston Navy Yard to loan to Mr. E. J. V. Huiginn four (4) 32 pounder guns and twelve (12) VIII-inch empty shell, for the purpose of marking the burial place of Myles Standish, as therein requested.

Mr. Huiginn has been informed of the Bureau's action.

Respectfully,

WM. M FOLGER,
Chief of Bureau.”

Second letter.

5134

“Subject: Loan of guns, etc.

Bureau of Ordnance
Navy Department

Washington City, Sept. 26th, 1892.

In reply to No. 6285

Mr. E. J. V. Huiginn,
Duxbury, Mass.

Sir:—

At the request of Hon. Elijah A. Morse, M.C., the Bureau has directed the Boston Navy Yard to loan you four (4) 32-pounder guns, of 57 cwt. each, and twelve (12) VIII-

inch empty shell, for the purpose of marking the grave of Myles Standish.

These must be removed from the Yard without expense to the Government, and you will be required to give a receipt for them, specifying that they will be returned when called for.

You should communicate with the Commandant of the Boston Navy Yard in regard to their shipment.

Respectfully,

WM. M. FOLGER,
Chief of Bureau."

NOTES

In Salem, Mass., in 1636, there is a James Standish entered as a proprietor. His name is also spelled Standishe and Standige, but I have found Captain Myles Standish's name also spelled Standige in the Old Colony Records. This James of Salem is enrolled as a freeman of Salem on the 13th May, 1640, and he is recorded as a juryman in 1641. Later in 1642, he is mentioned as being in Lynn.

Who was this James Standish? Was he related to the Captain? He could not have been a son of the Captain by his first wife, for there is no such record, and if he were, as he was older than Alexander Standish, then he would have been the legal heir to all Standish's hereditary estates. Who was he?

There is a Thomas Standish of Wethersfield, Connecticut, who is mentioned as having died on the 5th December, 1692, aged about eighty years. Who was he?

If the picture of Standish which we reproduce is genuine it must be admitted that the dates on the picture, if correct, unsettle all theories about Standish's age. The picture apparently claims to have been painted in 1625, when Standish was in England, the date 1625 being in the upper left-hand corner. In the same corner it is stated that Standish is 36 years of age, or is it 56? If it is 36 years, then Standish was born in 1589, and could not have received a Commission from Queen Elizabeth, who died in 1603. If the figures for Standish's age are 56, then he was born in 1569, and could have received his commission in Elizabeth's time. If he were born in 1569, he would have been 87 years of age at his death. Perhaps the statement that he was "very ancient" at his death would be better borne out by the figures 56. Perhaps it was some other "M. Standish."

I almost forgot to say that I have a letter from Mr. Justin Winsor in which he says the location of Standish's grave depends on the location of the church in which the first three ministers preached. This point has been determined.

STANDISH'S GRAVE

Before

I stood beside the silent resting place
Of him, the bravest of New England's dead;
No monument was there, no slab to trace
His valor, or his worth, to tell whose bed
Of long deep sleep lay there beneath my tread.

The children of his love were there; he slept
With them within the nameless, darkened grave.
Beside their graves how often had he wept,
And heard the distant booming of the wave,
And round the little church the sad winds rave!

A grateful people honors all its brave,
Its fathers and the guardians of its weal,
The noble sons who died its life to save
And shed their blood upon the foeman's steel,
In witness of their truth, their love, their zeal.

But thou, the bravest of New England's sons,
Dost rest beside thy children here unknown!
Thou shouldst have marked the graves of thy loved ones,
New England,—or tell, if thy love has flown,
And thou, in death, thy Standish wouldst disown?

E. J. V. H.

A VISIT FROM STANDISH

After

I was sitting in my chamber
In the silence of the night,
Weaving fancies and unweaving,
When a visitor bedight
In a buckram suit made entry,
And stood still as any sentry.

Thus he spoke to me surmising
Who he was and whence he came,
"Pardon, Sir, this rudish conduct,
Standish M. they call my name,
I've just come from o'er the border,
Pray excuse my robe's disorder.

"I was walking out with Pluto,—
You recall him I daresay,—
This p.m., Sir, when he told me
That a man had called today,
Who from Duxbury had traveled
And this tale to him unraveled.

"That my Duxbury fellow-townsmen
 Cared so little for my dust
 That they left unfenced the graveyard
 Where I rested,—'twasn't just,—
 Had I known it, I'd have made 'em
 Rue it, yes, Sir, I'd have flayed 'em!

"That not even was a token
 Placed beside the lonely bed
 Where I, Standish Myles of Standish,
 Mouldered neath their cattle's tread!—
 "'Twas an oversight?'—'Twas worse, Sir,
 'Twas enough to make one curse, Sir!

"That the graves of little Standish
 And his loved ones, Alden's too,
 Sweet Priscilla's,—were forgotten,
 Where we rested no one knew,
 Till you came and dug me up, Sir,
 And I couldn't stay to sup, Sir.

"But at once I've come to see you,
 And to thank you face to face;
 We'll be all so pleased to know you
 When you reach our little place;
 Wife and babes 'll gladly greet you,
 Ta, ta! happy, Sir, to meet you!"

E. J. V. H.





JAN 78



N. MANCHESTER,
INDIANA

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 014 069 638 9